

FORE-WORD.

I trust I have said nothing new in all this book.

CHAS. A. DOBSON.


DEDICATED
TO
MY OLD BOYS

In the sincere hope that this work will
be of some use to them.

CHARTER

2703 (12-18-82)

The above mentioned ship is hereby
chartered to the U.S. Navy



GOD AND MAN

OR

The Elements of a Natural Religion.

INTRODUCTION.

Religion, according to the Latin word from which it is derived, means a re-binding, a binding again, a second bond. Admitting that there is a God, and that man depends on Him, is bound to Him by this tie of dependence, religion implies that man, too, freely admits, loyally accepts, and lovingly *holds fast* to this link that connects him with his God.

Religion has been defined by Matthew Arnold as, "morality touched with emotion." This is a good and complete definition, but not explicit enough. It omits to point out the foundations of this morality, and the grounds of this emotion. What is morality? What is its connection with religion? How are the emotions aroused and maintained? This last is an important question. The emotions have been the source of all the power religions have ever had to compel, control, and exalt, the actions of men. History shows to what extremes, how enthusiastically, and with what world-wide consequences this has been achieved. In other words, on what is 'morality' to be based, that it shall rule the primal passions of man by an emotion, a passion stronger than any the strongest of them all? Unless we find a practical answer, religion will fail of

its principal aim and object. It will remain merely a study, cold and productive of nothing but an argumentative, or, at best, an enquiring spirit. It will remain a philosophy, and not a religion.

On the other hand the ground-work of religion must be supplied by the understanding. Its intellectual basis cannot be ignored. There is a false idea very common at present, a fashionable fallacy, which holds that it matters little what a man believes, provided he leads a good life. If this merely meant that the really important, the essential part of all religion consists of right conduct, it would, as far as it goes, express a great truth. But it is incomplete, and, as such, harmful. Put into other words, it is the same as saying that a man's thoughts and ideas do not in any way influence his conduct. So expressed, there are very few indeed, who would accept the statement. It is this fallacy that Carlyle opposed when he asserted that "where belief is unsettled, there conduct is unsound."

In fact, three things are required. Men must first be convinced of the truth of whatever claims to control their actions. Truth is the first essential his nature demands. Truth is the basis of all morality. Next, the sense of duty should be formed, virtues acquired, character built up by right conduct. This should be the result of all sound religious teachings. However, duty, the formation of moral habits, or virtues, and right conduct as the end of all religion, may be theoretically admitted, and yet none of these things be, in any

way, reduced to practice. Indeed, virtue may be much admired, and yet denied to be practical for the majority of men. The true may lead to the good as a speculative conclusion only. It may be agreed that a good life is a very desirable thing if only it could be made easier. The daily life of the will, conduct and character remain untouched, unchanged. This leads to the third need of all religion. Good must be made loveable by being shown to be the beautiful. To love all things are easy. This beauty, the splendour of the true, the loveableness of the good, is the source of the mighty power that makes the sinner a saint, transforms the man into the hero, exalts the human to the divine.

The true, the good, the beautiful, these three, and these three are one. The true, the good, the beautiful, these three, but the greatest of these is the beautiful. It has been the defect of all purely natural religions and ethical systems, either to emphasise the intellectual basis too exclusively, or, to enumerate a long list of duties in a catalogue or table of virtues. Men are given either a subtle philosophical treatise, or a dictionary of proverbs and moral maxims. Righteousness, the pearl of great price, is presented to us in the hard dead shell of metaphysics, or, subjected to chemical analysis in a scientific laboratory. To value it aright we must see it shining with eternal splendour in the dazzling crowns of heaven, refulgent with the glory of the sun of righteousness himself.

And how is this end of all religion to be attained ? How is the infinite beauty of true goodness to be

revealed to human eyes ? Ah ! that is just the glory of our human nature. Not only have we heaven-born faculties and powers to that end, but the attaining of that end is the most crying need of our nature. Without it we can know no rest, no content, no joy. In infinite truth, goodness, and beauty alone can the heart of man find all it seeks to know, to love, possess. At present this is mere assertion. Experience, of this as of all else, can alone make it real for us. To help us to that experience is the work all religious education. To dig out the gold of truth, to fashion it aright, to crown ourselves with its splendour. this is the real life of man.

At first sight, the task might appear all but hopeless. "Truth ? What is truth ? ", cried Pilate. With the conflicting cry of a thousand religions around us each claiming to have exclusive possession of the infinite treasure of God's truth, well may we echo the question in despair, "Ay ! what *is* truth".

And as regards the good, is the answer any clearer ? What vice in the whole black catalogue of human wickedness has not concealed itself under an appearance of good ?

"Vice is a monster of such frightful mien

"As to be hated needs but to be seen."

But therein is the difficulty. It is not seen. Vice sincerely is mistaken for virtue, evil for good. History abounds with illustrations. The sacramental blood-bath anointing the new king of Dahomey at the cost of two hundred human lives, the horrors of human

sacrifice among the Druids of ancient Britain and the aborigines of Central India, the savage cruelty of religious persecution, murders, lies, lasciviousness, all have been and are cloaked under the appearance of good, sanctioned in the name of religion. No wonder men have been found who held that the source and root of all evil was just this religious instinct of man. The devil has transfigured himself into an angel of light, time out of number, in the history of the world. How shall we distinguish the good from the evil now when the whole human race has so often and so cruelly erred in the past. What *is* goodness ?

And again what beauty can there be in such a world that it should be capable of awakening love and enthusiasm in our hearts, when its foundations, the good and the true, are as unstable as water, as illusive as the mirage ? What is there certainly true undoubtedly right, invincibly worthy of love ? This must be answered, and clearly, or our life is to no purpose, and not worth living.

A further difficulty stands in the way of a student of natural religion, though merely an external one. This is the distrust with which all pastors and masters look upon the religious doctrines of a layman. It is a poaching on their preserves. However, natural morality does not touch on controverted religious subtilities. It cannot hope to be complete and perfect in itself. It deals with universally accepted truths, and common-sense views of life and action of man and God. Where it stops orthodoxy begins. It teaches

neither polytheism, nor pantheism. It does not discuss learnedly of the trinity or unity of God. It neither affirms nor denies the supernatural; neither defends nor opposes the possibility of miracles. It but embodies the axioms common to all religions. It cuts away the forests, removes the rocks and clears the ground for the theologian to build his religious edifice, with stones that fall from heaven, if he will have it so. Of what natural religion supplies he may pick and choose, take or leave, add or subtract, as he pleases.

Nor is this work too vague and broad to be of much practical value in the study of things divine. Natural religion occupies a sphere apart from which it cannot rally forth to dispute the teachings of supernatural religion. The natural revelation made by and through the reason alone, and subject to the gradual growth of all human knowledge is the matter of natural religion. Like all human knowledge, too, it is capable of continual correction and completion. It can never claim to have said the last word. Of the world of supernatural knowledge it knows nothing and says nothing.

This is in marked contrast with the great religions of the world that claim a special revelation independent of reason. The Aryan Rishis, the Persian Zoroaster, Gautama the Enlightened, Mohamed the Prophet of God, the Hebrew Lawgivers and Prophets, Jesus the Son of Man and his Apostles, all claim to tell of the mysteries of God, to bring a special message to man of God's nature and of the means of attaining happiness in and through Him. What they have to

say nor you nor I, nor any of the ordinary sons of men can hope to acquire by any purely human means. They and their message are supernatural, and in most cases, supported by stupendous wonders. Mysteries and miracles abound in the Sacred Books of the East and West.

Another great difference between all popular religions and this consists in the fact that they not only deal with the supernatural, but they, in most cases, require that the faculties of man shall be elevated and made supernatural also, before he is made fit to accept, acknowledge and revere the higher truths they profess to teach. The divine gift of faith, divine grace, the developement of the astral, psychic and yet sublimer spiritual faculties, intuition, the divinizing of the mind by practice of Yoga, vocation, consecration, &c., are in these religions required as predispositions to the reception of their supernatural truths. Natural religion touches nothing of all this. It appeals to reason alone. It submits to all correction that the mind of man may, with the passing of the years, be enabled to make. It hopes to grow.

Besides, a natural religion that hopes to be practical must take up a yet humbler position. Even when dealing with what reason tells us of God and man there are problems very difficult to solve, questions hard to answer, conclusions most laborious to prove. These subtle points must be left untouched. The ordinary man can not hope to understand all things. The ordinary man has no time to study a

philosophical Theodicea. A study of God and man that aims at being of daily use must strive to get at truths admitted by all by means of common sense, at the right and wrong of acts such as all will readily admit, and at a happiness that will appeal to the hearts of all men.

What is the ideal of such a study? It is an ideal that we can never hope to realise, no more than any other. We can only aim at drawing nearer and ever nearer to it. Whatever we reach and secure must in its turn give place to something clearer, fuller and better. But what this ideal is, I must now indicate as briefly as I can.

First, its teachings must in no way be opposed to any known truth. It must be frankly dependent on science, and the scientific spirit especially on the exact sciences. History, philosophy and theology are largely out of court here. The voice of history grows ever feebler as it comes to us across the slowly lengthening lapse of years. Philosophy is a subtle tongued goddess, whose language has a thousand different meanings according to the various dispositions of mind and heart among her followers. The man in the street does not understand her learned speech. And theology asks for a special faculty in her hearers. Let those who have ears to hear, hear. But still, a vast sphere remains, the world of human nature, of the individual man, body, mind and heart, of the social man in the home, the town, the tribe, the State, the community of nations. Of these science speaks in language more of

less clear, as the problems it deals with are more or less complicated. But no statement really proved by any science should disagree with the teachings of natural religion. Again, it is necessary to repeat, there is no claim to being true once for all, and still less, on all points. There are not very many conclusions as certain as the law of gravity. Science is progressive, and accepts many a thing merely on trial. The probably true of to-day becomes the very doubtful of to-morrow, and, may-be the false of the day after. The doctrines of natural religion must be capable of growth, progress and evolution. Such is the law of everything that hath the breath of life. "The thoughts of men are widened with the process of the sun." This indefinite capacity of being changed, corrected and revised is a test of any purely natural system of religion as it is of science.

However, all fundamental truths, both mental and moral, are self-evident. These axioms are the only dogmas of natural religion. "Verum quod semper, quod abique, quod omnibus verum"—"That is true which is true always, everywhere, and for all." And with this axiom changed by one word, we have a test of real good. "That is real good which is good always, everywhere, and for all."

And what do we understand by good? That which tends to develop all the individual is the good of that thing or person. The definition of good derived from a reference to the end or purpose of a thing is logically the more correct. That gives the real meaning

of the word. The good of a thing *is* that which fits it for the end and purpose of its being. However, the former definition is perhaps, the more practical. It seems easier to study a thing as it is, than to try to find out what it was *meant* to be and do. It matters little. A thing achieves its end by being what it is, and the more perfectly it is what it is by nature, the more perfectly it will attain the purpose of its existence.

Finally, the beauty that is to arouse the emotions and sway the whole man, the delight of love that is to flood the soul and make of religion a motive power to rule the world, this beauty will come forth unsought for, and reveal herself untaught. It is the *splendor veri*, the glory of God's truth; the *splendor boni*, the light of God's holiness. In it the true and the good are merged as in their element. All beauty is divine. As soon as man has learnt to see God in nature the glory of the kingdom of God is his in proportion to his realisation.

"The world is so full of such beautiful things,

"I am sure we should all be as happy as kings."

To child and man, God's beauty is revealed. We have the power to shut our eyes.

To summarize in yet simpler language, man seeks happiness and finds it only in well-being. But a man may know all truth regarding God, the world and man, and yet live a life opposed to nature as a vicious man. Or, yet higher, he may know the good and follow it but with effort, and hard striving, by struggle and

pain, by suppression and repression. Only then has he the liberty of the children of God free to do as he pleases, when he knows the right, loves it, and follows it with joy. Then only is his life the full expression of his nature. Then only is life worth living.

To know the true is the first step, to desire and follow the good is the second step, to love the true and the good and to rejoice in their possession is the perfection of life.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

THE TRUE-SATIYA.

Notion of God.

Through all the ages history speaks of a God, or gods, as recognised and worshipped by men. All nations of the world are at one in their belief in the existence of an invisible power, or powers, making and ruling the world. What is the basis, in reason, of this notion and of this belief, we shall see in the next chapter. The greatness of all the notion implies will be studied in the third chapter. This chapter takes into consideration only the universal human fact that this notion is common to all, exists in all minds.

One man may harshly say to another, as did the elder Mill, "Your God is my devil." Even then the fact remains. Each admits a God. They differ in imagining and describing Him. By the wild

African, He may be thought of as a fierce, blood-thirsty terror to be appeased at all costs, to another a dim, vague something underlying the wonderful mysterious world around us. He is of many forms, as to many in India. Or, perhaps, He is really multiplied into many gods, as among savages. He is absolutely One, as to Jews and Mohamedans. He is *Three Persons* and yet *One God, one Divine Nature*, as Christians hold. He is two-fold, an All-Good fighting an equal all-evil,—as, perhaps the Parsis, and certainly the Manichæans believed. He is one with His garment, the world; He is one soul animating His body, the universe; He is the One Reality underlying all appearances.

Of these, the idea of the savages that there are many gods,—not the higher idea that the one has many forms or aspects,—requires particular attention. It is the only contradiction to the statement that all men admit that there is one great first spirit,—one God, in the language of the English. But for this exception, the fact stands out manifest, that all the world, and at all times, held to this notion. Two considerations will show that even this belief is no real contradiction. First, to understand how wholly isolated the peoples of old times lived is not an easy thing for us who live in these days of steamships and railways, of telegraphs and the post office, of books and newspapers, that are daily cementing the different nations of the world together by a civilisation ever more and more equal. But, in that far-away past, not only was a nation apart from and almost unknown to other nations, but even the

tribe knew little of its neighbours, and nothing of the tribes beyond. Each family or village was a whole in itself, and held aloof from all others. In each of these, independently, arose the notion of a God. Each imagined its God according to its own peculiar bent. When circumstances drove neighbouring tribes into federation, each agreed to recognise his neighbour's god. When one tribe conquered another, the god of the victor was held to be the greater god of the two. Such was the first working of the spirit of toleration. The family god, then, the tribal god, and, finally, the national god was worshipped as greater respectively, the one than the other.

The second thought here is that a multiplicity of independent gods has existed only among very primitive races in the first stages of civilisation. The idea is a trait of the childhood of a people. At any rate, in no case, has polytheism, the crude belief in many gods, withstood higher conviction of there being but one God, no matter in what form this latter idea arose, or whence it came, or when. India had it centuries before Mahomed isolated and emphasised it, and preached it with the sword. The ignorant Indian might believe in this and that as gods, the Brahmans knew the all-plenitude of God. The words Parameswar, Mahadeo, &c., show, by the very texture of the title that this god or that was, after all the same first Lord, and that this was a not uncommon thought, even in the minds of the majority of the people.

From the above exposition it now seems clear that

the thought that there is One Supreme God of some sort is universal, i.e., common to all fully developed minds.

And what is there common to all these multifarious gods we see and hear of? The terrible monsters of African worship, the cruel Moloch to whom parents sacrificed their children, Venus the personification of sensuality, the Chariot-borne gods of the Sun, Bel, Indra, Phœbus, Apollo. What similarity can we find in these diverse forms? Nay, in different ages, the same race adopts different types of gods. Compare the early Vedic gods with the later forms of Puranic Hinduism. Consider together the two sentences. "Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones"; and, "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do." Take extremes. Contrast the dark demon of hate and blood, represented, for the African Obiman, by the feathers of vultures, serpent skins and human skulls, with the sublime idea of the Infinite and pure spirit, the great all-in-all of the Indian sage.

In addition to the fact of there being a true Supreme Being admitted by all what is there common here save this *that all ideas of God are creations of the human imagination, exaggerations of one or many characteristics of the complex being man.* The gods of all times and peoples are anthromorphic. In times and places where fear ruled, and men fought and slew and devoured one another, their god was a monster of strife and blood like themselves, but vaster, stronger, and so fiercer and more cruel still than they. What they feared in their enemies they magnified and

worshipped as their god. He like, them, was swift to hate and slay, but more terribly armed, with thunder and lightning, with earthquake and flood, with famine and pestilence. In calmer periods of the history of man the god became an idealised and glorified man. Jupiter was the ideal monarch; Venus, a dream of perfect womanly beauty; Apollo the type of manly and youthful splendour and life; Hercules the divinising of human physical strength. And lastly, as the nations grew yet more keen sighted and wise, God became for them a spirit, the mind of man deified.

That man's highest functions were those of his mind had come to be recognised and admitted by all thinking men. To them, God could no longer be a being subject to bodily limitations, inferior, in that, to the world grasping intellect, all-creating imagination, and insatiable will that man now consciously and proudly felt to be his own higher self. God was idealised mind. And so, as we shall see later, man came to the threshold of the infinite truth, but with the infinite untouched.

And all this process of evolution is natural, and rational, and ever more and more correct in the conclusion to which it attains. If Swinburne says, truly, that man made God after his own image, the Bible saying, which he parodies, that God made man after His own image and likeness, may be equally true just as well. Now the first is evidently true, the second is said to be supernaturally revealed. The result of the two statements is in one respect the same. Both

find a similarity between God and man. *In some way God is like man.*

Apotheosis, by which the hero becomes a god ; and Avater, by which the god becomes man are thus not hard to account for as probable, or, at least, possible notions. Thus is it that the manly virtues of the man Hercules fit him for divine honours ; and Romulus, the founder of Rome, is caught up into heaven. Hence the most popular incarnations are so entirely perfect men, and therefore, so powerful in their appeal to all the deepest emotions of humanity. Such is Rama, the perfect son and husband, the ideal of chivalrous kingship : such is Krishna, the child, the youth, the man, the lover, the warrior, the philosopher ; and, such, too is Jesus, the gentle and earnest lover of mankind, the Workman's Son the Man of Sorrows.

Were any of these really God made flesh, is not the question here. Orthodox theology claims to be able to prove her own assertions to the satisfaction of her followers. To her must go those who want the supernatural to supply a higher craving. Natural Religion puts no abstacles in their way, but is, indeed, their best preliminary. The God of nature must also be the God of revelation, if supernatural revelation there be.

It is believed, then, that, in some way, God is like man. It is natural that this should be so. How else does man know anything but by comparison, by the discovery of likeness and unlikeness. Such is the nature of all human knowledge. Once the idea arose


that there was a God,—however the idea was formed,—the immediate result of the notion was the stating of the new problem for solution,—“What is God like?—or “To what shall we compare God.” On earth there is nothing great, but man,” said Sir William Hamilton, and perceiving the truth of this, all nations have agreed in likening God to man. By magnifying his bodily powers, by artistically beautifying his own human perfections, or, by continuing Sir William’s aphorism, “in man there is nothing great, but mind,” *they concluded that God was a spirit, a much greater and more perfect mind.*

Later and fuller thought, as we shall see further on, soon convinced men that God must be incomparable, and, therefore, really and properly unknowable. But, even so, the human mind did not rest content. It used unnatural and strange blends of animals and men to symbolise the preter and supre-human nature of the gods. They were human headed lions with wings, eagle-headed, elephant-headed, multi-faced, multi-handed. These were symbols, signs of the more than human being men now believed their God to be. But to these symbols there clung the disadvantage, the evil, that, by the simple and the ignorant, the symbol was mistaken for the reality. This is no fault of the symbol. Symbols, as such, are but metaphors, in wood and stone it may be. As metaphors, they are a help to the thinking mind. Literally understood they are an obstructive crust, and hinder the growth of the mind, retard the formation of a

correct notion of God, and, cramping the idea of God, cramp also the efficacy, the power for good of that idea. *The nations of the world are learning to fear the employment of symbols so doubtful in their effects.*

But, besides this defect, that every thinking man may easily guard himself against, there seems to flow a graver and more unsatisfactory conclusion from these introductory considerations. If the idea of God is man-made different at different times according to the state of progress of the race, what is there really divine in the notion? Is it anything but an idea?—anything more than the work of man's imagination? What is this but man's own shadow magnified by the mists of his ignorance, that the poor wretch worships so whole-heartedly in tears, with blood, and unto death.

It will be necessary in the next chapter to examine this question so as to satisfy ourselves of the reality underlying the notion of a God, before we can pass on to the study of that reality, the living God. Here we must rest content with the reflection that such progress as we have seen in the growth of this idea, such advance from the crude to the refined, from the simple to the complex, from the partly true to the more and more true, is just the very nature and process of all human science.



CHAPTER II.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

Having, in the last chapter, briefly touched on the nature and origin of the notion of a God, we must now enquire whether it can be made clear to us that, to this notion, there corresponds something really existing. All, except Agnostics and Atheists, answer this question in the affirmative. The former assert that the real existence of God is something that we do not and can not know. The latter maintain that there is no God.

Now the truth of these statements—like that of any other proposition—will be certainly known, either because it is self-evident, or, because it can be proved. As regards the first, the truth of a proposition may be self-evident, also in two ways. So, when the mere consideration of the subject and predicate, without the help of any middle term of comparison, enables us to perceive that the predicate belongs to the nature of the subject. We have this first kind of self-evidence, for example, when we say that “The whole is greater than its part.” This is evident the moment we know the words, ‘whole,’ and ‘part.’ Such a statement is called an axiom. The second way in which an assertion is self-evident occurs when the subject, being directly perceived or known, is found to involve or imply the predicate: for instance the statement that this branch is covered with fresh leaves.

If the proposition, “God exists”, were known in either of these ways, there could be no such things as

Agnosticism or Atheism, except among lunatics. And yet, as we shall see later, the idea of existence is involved in the very notion of God as He is but, unfortunately, not in the vague way in which the notion arises for us. And so, again, could we see and know God as we see and know the branches of a tree, we would know not only that He exists, but that He could not be thought of as not existing without ceasing to be thought of as God. As it is we must take the longer process of demonstration or proof.

But here, however, we may remark that to the Idealists who believe that all reality is but 'thought' or 'thinking', the existence of God must be self-evident in just this way. They express this view in different forms, most of which are very subtle and abstract. The following is perhaps the simplest.

We have an idea of God, say they, as something than which nothing greater can be conceived. Now, that than which nothing greater can be conceived does exist, because, if it did not exist, something could be conceived greater than it, *viz.*, that it should be conceived existing. Supposing that Idealism is sound philosophy,—and the greatest minds have often been Idealists, especially in India and Germany,—then, that God exists is self-evident, and requires no proof. To the ordinary man such reasoning is apt to be very distasteful, as either, a nonsensical juggling with words, or, if he be more humble-minded, as an abstruse subtlety beyond his powers of understanding.

Let us proceed. Our conclusion, thus far, is that,

if Idealism be sound then, God's existence (for the Idealist, at any rate) is manifest. What process of reasoning will satisfy others? If we find any such argument, then, all the world, Idealists and Realists, will have admitted that there is a God. It will have been proved.

By proof is meant the making known the truth of a proposition which is not certain by means of what is certain: or, it is the making clear of the suitability of the predicate to the subject, by means of a common term of comparison.

Such is the form we employ to arrive at truth. We think. We reason. When thinking naturally, reasoning according to the natural laws of thought, we think and reason correctly. Logic asserts this. Indeed, *we must take it for granted that in thinking and reasoning, we are infallible.* Reason is the supreme judge of all human truth. What reason recognises as true, we, at any rate, must admit as certain. Higher spirits,—if any such there be,—may smile at our proud claim to infallibility, but, for us, the claim stands, unchallenged, unquestioned. What reasoning admits is true once for all. If it were not so, all study would be a futile waste of time. But, how this is done; how we reach out to the world outside the mind; what knowledge may be; what it is that in us thinks and knows, God, or the mind, or the brain; all these are not the question now. If reasoning shows us that God exists, for us at least, God really and truly is.

These remarks seem to be necessary here to meet the Sceptics, who deny the possibility of knowledge.

Strangely enough, they deny all certainty as a certainty, reject the conclusions of all reasoning by a process of reasoning, say that they know that they know nothing.

The Idealists are convinced that there is a God. The Sceptic can be convinced of nothing. What proof will satisfy the most numerous class of men, the Realists? We shall consider only the simpler of the many and various arguments that are used to convince men of the real existence of God.

The first is sometimes called 'the metaphysical proof.' It happens to be the most common, and the best understood. It may be proposed in the following manner:—

Where there is nothing, by and from that nothingness alone existing beings can not come forth. The void must remain a void. This is self-evident. But it is the nature of all we know around us,—of everything in this world,—that it was non-existing before it came to have being, and yet it is here and now. Therefore, it is by and from another. Its being is not due to itself. It is made to be. It is caused to exist by something, that, before it was a cause, was an effect of another cause, and that of another, and so on.

Let us put this in another way. The leaf stirs. Its motion was not, and now it has motion. That motion came from the wind. The motion of the wind, in its turn, is due, at least in part, to the motion of heat derived from the sun; that from the fierce motions that rage there. These solar heat storms come from some other motion, and that from another, *et cetera*.

So also, it is the nature of all this world, of the whole universe, to be caused, to be moved, made to be. Hence we conclude, that it proceeds from a self-existent, uncaused cause, an unmoving first mover, that we call God.

But is this the only way of explaining the origin of the world? Can we not conceive an endless chain of caused causes, moving movers caused and causing, moving and moved, from all eternity, till we reach a motion that moves unmoving, and does not partake in the motion it gives?—Not so.

In a series, what is said of all the individuals separately can be said of the whole set collectively, provided there is no consideration of quantity involved in the statement. The qualities of the parts of a series are qualities of the whole series. It is true, that if one horse cannot pull a train, there is no reason why six hundred might not be able to do so easily, because their strength is a measurable quantity, and increases with addition. But as regards qualities, similar reasoning will not hold. If each horse in the six hundred be white the whole number are not six hundred times whiter. If each be blind, there can be neither more nor less sight in a million blind horses than in one.

Apply this principle to the endless series of caused causes. Each cause in the series is essentially an effect, and therefore, it is evident that the whole series must be an effect also. Number does not affect nature. Hence, being an effect, the whole series must

be an effect of an uncaused *cause* the motion of an unmoved *mover* outside the series as such.

This is the ordinary argument of the generality of men, and fully satisfies them that there is a *Great First Cause*.

There is a further and a fuller form of this proof that is known as the *Argument from Design*, which concludes not only that there must be a *First Cause*, but also that it must be supremely intelligent. This, by Flint, is called the *Argument from Order to Design*.

The greatest of the Pyramids of Egypt is pierced by a long perforation, through which it is possible, at all times of the night, to see and fix the position of the North Star. From this fact alone, we, without a moment's hesitation, refer the whole structure to the work of a student of the stars, even if we can gather no further information about him. Now, what is the mental process by which we arrive at so definite and decided an opinion? We find the great pile fit for a certain purpose, and one that requires a very nice adapting of means to the end. Such adaptation we know to be the work of a thinking mind, and hence, we conclude to such a mind. In the case of our example, the end is astronomical, and we conclude that its author was an astronomer.

Now, science,—modern science, especially,—shows us that all the complex happenings on this earth, through countless ages in the past, are resulting in a constant progress and development of ever higher and more perfect being. Even if, in common with all life,

it should as surely and slowly sink through gradual decay to final death, yet, even so, we are justified in concluding that life process has been consciously intended. The whole is the result of such complex co-operation and harmonious organization, that it is as intelligible to say that the jolting of the letters of the alphabet together might, by chance, result in the composition of a *Ramayana*, or a *Shah Nameh*, as to ascribe all this wonderful world and its orderly life to mere chance. Even the greatest catastrophes work to results beneficial to the whole. Earthquakes, wars and famines, for instance, have brought the most different races of the world into closer intercommunion, not only by the call for brotherly help, but even by the selfish workings of trade and commerce.

Another sign of intelligence here is the simplicity of the means employed over such vast and widely dissimilar spheres of action. The infinite host of suns and stars and the drop of a blade of grass, the motions of the heavenly bodies and the trickle of a dew-drop are all expressed in the one law of gravity, are reproduced in the sections of one geometrical figure, the cone. What unity amid infinite diversity : Surely all this apparent method is permeated with conscious purpose, is *intentional*, real method ? Surely the regularity and order which the mind seeks to find everywhere, are not all its own work, not merely a classification of its own knowledge, but a discovery of method and regularity that lends itself to being so ordered and classified. Surely, the book of the universe which allows of such order-

ly exposition by the student is a convincing proof of its Author and His Infinite Intelligence.

Finally, we have the so-called moral proof of God's existence. It is the nature of human reason to tend ever more and more to the truth, and practical proverbial wisdom asserts that two heads are better than one. They correct and complete each other. And when large bodies of men unanimously accept an opinion we may be certain of its containing a great deal of truth. It is the truth and not the error, the good and not the evil, that has spread every widely accepted form of belief, has secured its general adoption. Hence, when the belief is universal, permanent, and corroborated by the most careful and earnest thinkers, we may rest assured that we have a truth of great moment embodied in that opinion or belief. And such, precisely is the conviction of the human race about the existence of a supreme Being, the Maker and Ruler of this great world, *God*.

This then is our conclusion. To the Idealist, God's existence is self-evident: to the Realist, the Great First Cause is as certainly proved. All thinking men accept one or the other of these systems of thought. Even the ignorant dimly and vaguely reason as we have done, and believe in some sort of a God. Hence, *all the world admits that God exists.*

CHAPTER III.

THE NATURE OF GOD.

What is God? How shall we define God? What, in God, is the source of all God is in Himself? What is the ultimate reality in God? In other words, what is the essence, or nature of God? Can we answer these questions at all, or in part? How are we to set about seeking the answer to these questions, if they be answerable?

The last of this string of interrogations leads to a question of fact, *viz.*,—How does human reason set about seeking to know what God is? Surely, by whatever led that reason to conclude that God exists. To the Idealist, be he Christian Transcendentalist, Mahommadan Sufi, or Brahman Vedantist, the very notion 'God' implies real existence, Self-Being. To the Realist, God was proved to exist uncaused by anything out of Himself. God is, therefore, Self-Being, necessary Being; not what may or may not be, but what must be.

Therefore, for all, God is Being, necessary Being. This looks as though we had arrived at a definition. Let us see whether it be so. A definition gives the 'genus' or general class, and the difference that marks and distinguishes the defined from the rest of its class. For instance, "Man is a rational animal." The general class 'animal' includes the smaller class, 'man', which, again is separated from other animals by its distinctive mark, 'rational'. 'Man' is now '*defined*'. Its '*fines*'

bounds, or limits are clearly marked out. 'Man' is now a fuller and clearer notion than animal. Have we a similar result when we say, "God is necessary Being?" No, because 'necessary' and 'caused' being stand apart. 'Being' applied to all also has quite a different meaning to 'being' applied to God. It is not a common and more general class than either. In, or by His Nature, God exists, is Being: things, in, or by, their nature are not. Their nature is not-to-be. They must be made-be, caused to be. He, by His Nature, is and must be.

How, what can limit necessary, or Self-Being? Nothing: It is unlimited, infinite. Nothing external can limit God's Being, His Godhead, because all external to Him is not by nature. Nor can anything in Him do so, for all in Him is necessary Being, essentially is Being, not non-being or limit. God is infinite, *i.e.*, without limits, for a limit means a boundary or end of a thing, its not-being. Hence, the sentence, "God is Infinite", is a double negation. God has Being that is *no* how *ended* no how not being. This means that God is the Fullness of Being.

Fullness of Being is what is meant by the Infinitude of God. The Isavasya Upanisad, hence, calls Him "The Full". All other is by and of Him, but leaves Him unchanged, and nor adds nor takes from Him. If it did either, God were not Infinite, were not Self-Being, were not God. "OM. That is Full: this is full; from that Full, this full enamates. Taking away this full from that Full, the Full still remains behind."

And again, in the Manduka-Upan, I. 1. "That which is denoted by the word "OM" is verily this imperishable Brahman. That is Full...The Imperishable is in the past, present and future. The Full is verily OM.

To proceed with our reflections on the finite and the infinite, we may notice that we *are*, i.e., have being only 'now' The past is no more. The future is not yet. Our being is bound by the imperceptible time-dividing line between the past and the future,—truly a miserable nothing of an existence. *God always is. His Eternity is a now permanently present, with no past and future of anything lost or gained.*

We are here and not there: and partly here and partly there. *God's Immensity is a boundless Here and an All-here.* "A sphere whose circumference (or limit) is nowhere, and whose centre is everywhere". This is what we conceive as God's Omnipresence, of which more later,

God is Unchangeable. His Immutability is as clear as all else we have seen. If He were to change it must be either to other being, or to a better or worse state of being. If He changed into another God, the difference, if real, would be a more or less of being. And the same must be said as regards a change of state. If capable of more or less being, God would not be full, infinite Being, necessary Being, Self-Being; would not be God.

Again, all action is something that can exist. Hence, Divine, full Being includes the idea of God being a pure act, involving all action. God is Absolute,

All-life, Essential Knowledge, absolute, All-will, All-bliss, etc.

Now, all these ways of speaking of God's Infinitude, His Eternity, His Immensity, His Immutability, His Omnipresence, Omnipotence, Wisdom, Love, and so forth, are all but various ways of saying God is essential being; only different points of view we take to help our thoughts; merely, divisions made by finite human thought in the Indivisible. To correct our thoughts, we must add that in themselves all these are one and the same. All in Him are the same reality. God is internally One. This, philosophically speaking, is the simplicity of God. *God is pure, unmixed Being.*

Once more, if All-being, Infinite being is God, there is no room for the thought even of another God. *God is sole, also externally.*

The commentary of Madhavacharya on the Manduka-Ūpan, II-1-10. says; "That which is called the Activity of the Lord, that which is styled the Wisdom of the Supreme Self, all that verily is the Lord,—so also, the Divine attributes, like Strength, Power, &c." So, too, we have the Sruti:—"Wisdom, Power, and Action are his essential Nature." Svetasvatara, 1—6.

These are not here quoted as authorities, nor will such Scriptural texts from any source whatever, be brought forward as of any value apart from the reasonableness of what is contained in them. In the language of the schoolmen, *Tantum valet auctoritas quantum valet ratio.* After his study of Natural

Religion is ended, the reader may turn to any such Holy Writ as shall have satisfied him of its supernatural origin. Throughout this work they are but meant to show that East and West are at one in their assertions regarding the Divine Nature.

Now, all these statements correspond to nothing that is known to the human mind. Man made God to his own image. Man now corrects that error. God transcends all that man knows. God is like nothing known to us. But this is a grave consequence to arrive at. Our only process of knowing is by comparison. This takes away all terms of comparison. This compels us to say that *God is Unknown and Unknowable*.

The Upanisads in many places repeat this confession of ignorance. The Bible is not behind hand in similar acknowledgment of the inability of the human intellect to grasp the Divine. By quite a different route, Spencer, the great synthetic philosopher of the Victorian Age, reached the same conclusion. The Greeks of olden days, perchance for a like reason, built, among those of their other gods, an altar to the Unknown God. A poor conclusion this would seem to be to all our reasoning hitherto.

Once again I quote from the Upanisads. They express perfectly the stage we have reached, and point the way to what lies beyond. The Kena Upan. II-2. and 3. says;—"I do not think I know Him fully: others say, 'We know Him fully.' Nor do I say that I know Him not at all, for I know. Amongst us, who says, 'I know Him,' he knows Him not. He who says, 'I do

not know Him,' he knows indeed."—"Of whom the opinion is, 'Brahman is not to be thought of,' by him is He rightly thought. He who thinks, 'Brahman has been thought of by me,' he does not know. By those who consider, 'We have realised Brahman,' He has not been realised. By those who consider, 'We cannot fully realise Brahman,' He is realised."

The Manduka Upan I.6., says, "The tranquil in heart see the Imperishable as the source of all beings, and know Him to be invisible, unseizable, without genus, without species, without eyes or ears, without hands or feet, all-powerful, all-pervading, and extremely subtle, as the unchanging source of all things."

These quotations, while stating what we do not know, point out what is known. First, *we know that this unknowableness of God does not arise from emptiness of object in Him.* He exceeds knowledge. Second, *we know that He is the source of all things.* This second is a fruitful consideration.

All is from God. Now, these are from Him knowingly produced, or, unconsciously put forth. In either case, *things are like Him after all*; like His ideas of them in the first case, effects of His nature, in the second, and so again, like Him. Like Him somehow, but unlike Him, too, as we have seen. How shall we reconcile this antithesis? Here, as in everything, we see existence bounded by non-existence. All that has existence has it of and by God, and is so far a revelation of His Being. All that is limit or non-existence leaves us dark as to Him. Now matter and extension are but

measure and limit. This gives no idea, even incomplete, of God. The powers of the mind on the other hand are able to conceive their own actions as boundless. Wisdom to know, Love to desire, Joy to delight are as their objects. We can well conceive in God, Knowledge, Love, Joy, etc., as boundless as their object, Himself.

But, again, we must correct ourselves, and say that all this Divine Knowledge, Love, Joy, Power, etc., are God's Own Self, His Nature, His Being. We say this, but this we do not understand. We find it unlike all we know. We know that we cannot know Him, and so, verily, we do know Him.

With the correction that the infinite lies beyond all we truly know about him, we may rightly say that God is All-wise, All-powerful, All-holy, &c. By the necessity of our finite nature, we divide the absolutely one. But, then, we deny our division, and restore the Unity of Being to our thoughts.

We name God by these finite conceptions, which we use for comparison's sake, but we must not forget the corrective to all such titles. "God is Love," say, the Christian Scriptures. "God is Beauty," said the Prophet Mahomed. These names are useful, and of the greatest value to rouse the emotions. These, and such other humanly coloured names are dear to the heart of man, but, the name of names, the nearest approach of the finite to the Truth is the simplest of all, just BEING, Self-being.

This conclusion of reason is strongly supported

by Scriptures that claim a higher than human source. In the Zoroastrian faith, also, this is one of the most secret names of the Lord, as is shown in the following extract from the *Hormuzd Yasht*:—Then spake Zarathustra: Tell me, then, O pure Ahuramazda, the name which is Thy greatest, best, fairest, and which is most efficacious for prayer. Thus answered Ahuramazda: My first name is AHMI—IAM.....and my twentieth is AHMI YAD AHMI MAZDAO—I AM THAT I AM." Avesta XVII, 4 and 6.

This was also the most secret name of God among the Jews, as we learn from the Old Testament, *Exodus*, III, 13 and 14. "And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the Children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say unto me, what is His name? What shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and He said, Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."

Among the followers of Islam, the name *Khuda*, means the Self-existent.

And again, we have the same, great, ineffable name in the *Isavasya Upan. Man.* 16. "That yonder person who dwells in Asu—Life—is known by the name of AHAM 'I,' and ASMI—'I AM.'"

The practical result of these subtle considerations is to point out that *the most unlike systems of religion are at one in their conceptions of the nature of God.* We ordinary men cannot go far wrong if we accept

their statements, as far as we understand them. Their effect on conduct and the emotions is matter for study, further on.

NOTE —1. All the passages here quoted from the Upanisads are from the translation of Srisa Chandra Basu, in Vol. I. of the Sacred Books of the Hindus. If the other volumes of the series prove as delightful reading as this, the boon conferred on English students of Comparative Religion will be inestimable.

NOTE.—2. The mystic word OM, philologically considered, bears the signs, in its broad vowel and elementary consonant, of being a very old word,—a pre-Sanskrit root,—expressing the same great name referred to above, I AM. The Greek *to on* seems a derivative, like the English *am*.

CHAPTER IV.

THE WORLD.

What we have learnt so far of the Supreme Being has been either the result of reasoning on the contingent nature of the world this has led us to admit the existence of a Great First Cause; or, again that Being's existence has been regarded as a self-evident truth. The consequence accepted by all has been the same. His ineffable name, meaning Self-Being, has been recognised as expressing the Divine Nature, best, though that Nature remains ever fully and adequately unknown. Yet it is ever more and more being known by studying the world that is made by Him.

But, what is the world? How did it originate? Why is it? These are questions almost as differently answered as there are different students of the problems they state. As before, we shall avoid discussion and consider only what is universally accepted.

Here are some of the replies one meets with. What is the world? Say one set of thinkers, the world is nothing but the thoughts of God made objects of human consciousness,—God's thoughts as learnt by men. Others say that the world is only matter in varied forms,—inertia and energy,—called into being, and kept in existence by the Divine Power. The materialist asserts that all we know is that, the world is the object of our senses, and of the knowledge we can derive from them by the help of our reason. The Pantheist says the world and God are one. The Monotheist declares that God and the world are apart, beyond the power of mind to think how far apart, being respectively infinite and finite. The former holds that the world emanates or flows forth from the Divine Being, though it leaves the Divine unchanged. It is pervaded by God, say the latter, but does not share in any way in His Essence, or Nature.

How came the world to be? Theists answer: It was created, when, with the world, time began, *i.e.*, it was not, and was made by the Will of God. Some hold that it was produced perfect and complete; others, that it is still progressing and evolving. (Scientific men are unanimous as regards this last sentence.) Another some maintain the world always was. God always creates. It is His Nature to do so, though for his own sake, of course:—What motive out of Himself has the All-Self-sufficient? God said, and says, "Let this world be," and it came into and continues in existence, momentarily renewed.

Why was the world made to be? Here are some of the answers: For God's accidental glory. For man to attain to God: For God's good pleasure: To communicate His happiness to those to whom He gives being. To work out the Divine energies, &c., &c. "Why the world exists is yet more difficult to answer, unless we are content to say that it exists for all the ends and purposes that it does *de facto* fulfil.

Now, what stands out in all this jumble of answers? *This, that the world has its source and present being in God, Who, at least pervades and sways it.* Sanskrit philosophers have, most subtly, analysed the process which they believe underlies the emanation or coming-forth of the finite from the infinite. Christians, Mohamedans, and Jews say God willed the world and it was and is. *Whether it be of God one way or the other, it tells of Him.* It reflects Him. It is, at least, as it were the handi work of God. Much more is it a manifestation of God if it is Divine in its very stuff, so to speak; if it is God himself in varied forms and appearances, or, even if it be a dream, or sport of the Divine. Even if it be a cloak or veil, it serves to make the Invisible, visible. It is like the veil of Moses to hide the blinding brightness of the Light of God.

Either way, all agree that the world makes known, in its finite manner what is otherwise, and in itself, the Infinite Unknown, Nature, or the way the world proceeds, grows, changes, develops, decays, &c. is all ascribable to God, either as willed by Him, or, as

Himself apparently going on, growing, undergoing seeming change and development. Either way, *whatever is natural is Divine at least inasmuch as it is God-willed.*

This is a very important conclusion to have arrived at. It leads to a further practical consequence still more important. From it immediately follows not only that whatever is natural is good, but the moral rule, "What is natural is right." If the first shows us a way to contemplate the Divine in the finite, the second may be found to lead us to a yet more intimate union than that of the knower and the known, *viz.*, that of the lover and the loved. But this we shall see only in the second part of this work. Let us return to the study of the immediate matter of our thoughts.

Nature is Divine is a truth that becomes further emphasised when we consider what Western philosophers of the Middle Ages, Christian and Mohamedan, knew as the Divine Concursus or Concurrence. Every action, as we said before, has a being of its own. As such, this also is due to the influx of Divine energy. I walk and run, because the power of God in me enables me to do so. My walking and running is as much and more God's than mine. This is so even from the point of view that looks upon Nature as not God but God's creation. Much more is the conclusion valid when the world is regarded as an appearance or emanation of God Himself.

Another thought that is of untold value in this

connection is what is known as God's Omnipresence, or Imminence. God is everywhere, and all God everywhere. A part of God is not in this room and a part in that ; nor a part in the furniture and a part in my body, and a lesser part in my mouth and ears. But all God is not only present, preserving every minute particle of matter, but actively moving and directing, every ether thrill, swaying leaf and passing thought. This needs no proof. It follows from the nature of God as understood above. All that is is the action of God. "In Him we live and move and have our being." *To study the world is to study at least, the works of God.*

This conclusion opens up the difficulty of explaining what is naturally evil, and adds to it. Before attempting the solution of that great problem, the existence of evil, we shall first distinguish between individual nature, and the nature of the whole world considered as one result of Divine action, or Being. We shall do so as concretely as possible.

It is natural for every individual thing to maintain its own well-being. This is evident for all living things. They all tend to the development of their own natures, the preservation of their own lives. It is equally natural for them to do so at the cost of the destruction of other lives for food, or, in self-defence. The forest trees and the blades of grass struggle with one another for the sunlight and the rain. What one gains the other loses. More directly antagonistic we see the deer devour the grass, the tiger slay the deer. The

snake kills with its poison fangs both animals and men. For each the action is natural, and so, according to our previous conclusion, Divine. But to what does all this struggle tend? What is natural for the whole?

Evidently, this is a question of fact. It tends to the ultimate victory of the strongest, or the swiftest, or the shrewdest. What was made originally the fittest for the fight or naturally developed to become the ablest fighter is to be the Divinely appointed, *i.e.*, the natural winner. And here man stands out pre-eminent, as lord and master of the world by right of conquest, his natural, his Divine right, established by his ability to meet the tiger with repeating rifles, to counteract snake-bite by the injection of malt vinegar, or permanganate of potash. *Man's superiority is naturally acquired, and therefore it was Divinely intended.*

This leads to the conclusion that the well-being of the human race is the natural, or Divine end of all that is upon the surface of the earth. All that opposes it may be natural individually; all that favours it is natural universally, at least as far as we know.

Now, this appears a very paltry conclusion to have reached. So it must seem to one who knows anything of the teachings of modern astronomy. The starry spaces, depth beyond depth, as far as thought can go, are filled with mighty suns and their attendant planets, amidst which our earth is, literally no more than a grain of sand among the myriad other grains upon the wide sea beach. How ridiculous it seems, in the light of such knowledge, to say that all this

Divine display is but for puny man. Let us hasten to clear this objection. We must above all be practical. The end of inanimate things on earth, is to minister to the needs of life, and of all other living creatures to serve man. This we find, *de facto*, to be the regular process on this earth, and, speaking of this *earth* alone, we concluded that the end *on this* earth, of all the operations of nature, was the perfecting of the human race. Of wider ends, beyond this little earth, in which the heavenly bodies have their part we know nothing. And yet, even these bodies man, naturally using his reasoning powers, employs to serve a purpose beneficial to himself. The contemplation of the star-strewn firmament above, ennobles his mind, widens its grasp, teaches him more of that Infinitude, Whom we dimly perceive, *as it were*, at work on such a stupenduous scale. This is, at any rate, a minor end and purpose, that the stars can be made to serve. We do not pretend to speak of their place in the cosmic plan, in which, no doubt, the earth bulks no larger than it does in a chart of the skies.

CHAPTER V.

THE HUMAN RACE.

The considerations of this chapter are suggested by the question whether this natural struggle which has established the superiority of mankind is to be continued among men, too, till the fittest race survives. History alone can answer this. If she fails to settle the point, the question remains open. " Assyria,

Greece, Rome, Carthage ;—where are they ?” Egypt, Persia, Rome, Spain, France and England, have each in turn taken up a leading position among the civilised nations of the world, but all fall back again. What is the history of the fallen ? Does there stand out any rule or principle, clearly, underlying all the chaos of wars and intrigues we read of in the stories of the past ? What is the natural process of this rise, decline and fall ? Could we answer this we might, perhaps, discover the end to which all this world struggle tends.

Cecil Rhodes, who established British power in South Africa, maintained that, as far as he could judge, the natural trend of the world's later history has been to secure the spreading of the British Empire over all the earth. Helping in this, he thought, was to share in carrying out the designs of God, and therefore, to be sure of ultimate success. We may well smile at a partial patriotism such as this. An inhabitant of Spain in the days of Charles V, or a Moslem of the time of the earlier Moghul Emperors, might just as well, and with equal plausibility have concluded that it was the will of God to establish the superiority of his own people over Europe or Hindustan. We must take a wider look, and we shall understand that even in pre-historic times, in his conflicts with the “dragons of the prime”, man found the victory assured to him only when he fought united with his fellowman.

Here is a remarkable point to emphasise,—the assured victory of the united. Against the monsters of the geologic periods man was powerless alone. In

his mutual conflicts what do we see? Conquest has been a real growth only when expansion was followed by the welding of the defeated, and their victors into a compact whole. *When a people battles, but to enslave its victories are apparent, its success temporary.* Rome and Spain failed utterly to perpetuate their conquests, but the Norman occupation of England became a permanent fact because in the latter case, conquerors and conquered were compelled by isolation to unite. So the Mohamedan kingdoms of the Dakhin were stable because based on the firm foundation of mutual toleration. The same was the case with the Moghul Empire at Delhi, till Aurungzeb cut himself and his Moslems apart from the bulk of his subjects.

Once or twice we meet cases of the extermination of the conquered. This happens only when the combatants are one much stronger than the other, and also the one prolific and the other not so. Otherwise the attempt is a failure. In America, the Red Indian, and in Australia, the aborigines have died out of the land on the advent of the European, like the Lepcha of Sikkhim before the sturdy Gurkha of Nepal. The race that perished ceased to breed. On the other hand the Jews tried to exterminate their enemies in Canaan, and the Aryans, theirs in India, but now the Jew is an exile in Palestine, the Promised Land of his fathers, and the Mlechchas dwell in millions amid the hills and forests of Central India, and as in all these years, so now too, is slowly blending with the lower strata of the Aryan population.

Disunion, therefore, ruins the mightiest empires, and union builds them up. The German philosopher Fichte, a hundred and fifty years ago, saw that *the ultimate union of the whole human race was the goal to which the world process moved.* The pride of emperors, the ambition of the soldier, the merchant's greed and the zeal of missionaries, all, sometimes even in their own despite, directly or indirectly, were working out and co-operating towards this end. A common civilisation based on the spread of knowledge, and the spirit of love was to blend the nations of the world into a world-federation, as it had united kingdoms into empires, tribes into states, and families into tribes. As means to this end, Fichte foretold mutual emigrations and immigrations, the transfer of commodities from one end of the world to the other, and the continual interchange of thoughts and aspirations by the daily greater facilities of intercourse supplied by steam and electricity. The embryo air-ships of our day are a further step in this direction.

The extinction of a people is the exception, and is invariably the result of immorality leading to unnatural vice and racial suicide. Of this we shall see more later on.

The preceding considerations are strengthened from another point of view. Authority has its root in the headship of the father, the natural defender and provider of the family. Sociology at least in some cases, recognises the growth of the family into a tribe, with the consequent evolution of the father into the father-chief.

A picture of such a patriarchal family-tribe is given in the Bible, in the story of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The development of this family into the tribe and nation of Israel, is also narrated in the sacred pages.

The authority of the father would, in primitive times, be naturally absolute, and traces of this are seen in the power of life and death given by Roman law, to the *pater-familias*, over his children. This is the ultimate source of the natural and Divine right of kings, viz., the natural right of a father to the submission of his children. This elemental stage, however, did not long retain its primitive simplicity. The increase of the numbers of the family-tribe soon led to the delegation of the supreme authority to subordinate officials.

Again, in nations that have had a less peaceful growing time, the banding together of many families and tribes to resist foreign encroachment put authority into the hands of the ablest military leader. Abraham united in himself both functions, but in many cases, the military leader was chosen of the people for his fitness for what, in troublous times, came to be regarded as the chief duty of the ruler or king. Here we have another source, equally natural, of public authority. The ablest man, the *König*, or King was chosen by the council of patriarchs, or Wiseman, their *Witenagemet*. Now, literally, *vox populi* was *vox Dei*. The people naturally asserted their right to nominate the one best suited to ensure them peace and orderly government.

The patriarch was the source of hereditary authority : the military chief of the democratic principle.

Further evolution finds a subjugated lowest class. The slaves of the patriarchal families, and the Helots of Greece give us early instances of this menial class. The Government is not seen to be for their good. The Plebs of Rome were only able to secure the franchise, when Roman conquests had provided slaves enough to replace them. The priestly, soldier, and industrial castes of India had a substratum of Sudras, or base-born menials, as the foundation of their society. The Brahmins, Kshatriya, Vaish and Sudra point to an early organization similar to that of Rome with its Patres, Equites, Plebs and Servi.

This historical fact seems to be the result of the working of the process known as the 'Struggle for existence' among the individuals of the human race. But history also shows that this lowest class has always ruined its oppressors, even though it be after centuries of subjection. The appeal to their sense of equal manhood, whether made by invading Goths and Huns, by Islam or Christianity, has always met with a ready response in the hearts of the down-trodden class.

The Feudal Age saw the ascendancy of the warrior nobles and the Catholic hierarchy. This was broken up by the up-heaval of the citizen class in the French Revolution, after the Protestant Reformation had destroyed the temporal power of the Church. And now, the plutocracy of modern civilisation is undermined by the adherents of Socialism and the outrageous extremists of Anarchy and Nihilism.

The result of these facts seem to be that the struggle for existence among human beings leads to chaos and confusion. Indeed, as it explains little in the inanimate world, it confounds all true explanation of the growth of humanity, which lies above and beyond the vegetable and merely sensitive world. Says an American writer of to-day, Charles Wagner, in *The Upright Life*, "The struggle for existence does not take on the same form in all the degrees of life, and what is law in the world of plants and animals, may easily not count at all in the world of men. Fierce competition, the exclusion of some by others, "selection" by force and the destruction of the weak, is the law of the lower world, where plants deprive each other of light, and the beasts survive at each other's expense; but in the life of humanity another law rises into view. Our most precious possessions are those which increase by our sharing them with others. The very things that generally impede and embarrass life in the lower world, namely, nearness and union, favour the development of man, and of the new interests which make their appearance with human society. In union there is strength is a true saying for man; his law is solidarity; and, by this law, the wrong a man does to other men reacts upon himself, so that instead of increasing by this method, he decreases. Let a man destroy a man, a family a family, a nation a nation, and the consequences of the deed fall upon the doer inevitably." And again,—“We are all bound together, brothers in suffering in ignorance, in the poverty and the wealth of our

nature, whatever be our language, or colour, our conceptions, and our divergent material interests, a higher interest makes us one. You may fell trees without injuring the species, but you cannot strike a man, even the weakest or the humblest, without injuring humanity. Such is the cohesion of mankind that every action vibrates throughout the whole body." The community of man is further evidenced in trade, science, art, religion, which are all universal achievements of man for the whole race.

The full realization of this unity in all its perfection is the dream of all poets, the theme of all prophecies, the deepest aspiration of all good men. Yet "the far-off divine event, to which the whole creation moves," is still but a beautiful dream. Its practical value does not do more than point out a direction for the combined efforts of mankind. This progress may, conceivably, in its turn, give place to as gradual a disintegration, decay and ultimate death, in common with all life processes of which we know. The world must live and grow before it shall be ripe enough to drop and die. This period of growth is ours. Shall we refuse to live because, forsooth, one day it is appointed us to die? The silly girl in the German fable who wept because the needle she was sewing with might perchance prick the husband she might possibly marry, so that he should perhaps die would be a type of the man who should be discouraged at this thought. The idea is in now way of practical help.

CHAPTER VI.

THE NATURE OF MAN.

Leaving aside the end of the human race as of less practical value, let us turn to what more nearly concerns us, *viz.*, the problem of man's individual life. What is the end and purpose of my life? Let us put the question yet more concretely. How shall I secure my well-being? To answer this I must first know what man is in himself. What is his real nature, be he a merchant prince, or a factory hand, a leader of fashion and culture, "heir of all the ages, foremost in the files of time," or a derelict, left behind in the onward sweep of civilisation, a naked African, or Andamanese, savage and cannibal, and at most a shrewder brute than the ape.

What is man? A cunningly evolved play of matter and force, in which the brain secretes thought as the kidneys secrete urine. Man is the ablest of brutes. This is the Materialist's answer. Translated into practice it has invariably ruined individuals and nations. Man is an immortal soul God-created for heavenly bliss in union with his Creator. This is the Monotheistic position. Man is God in matter working up to liberation from material bonds and re-absorption into the Godhead. This is the Pantheist's conception of the destiny of man. I shall not attempt to settle their controversy, but consistently, with the purpose of these fundamental considerations, turn to the practical aspect of this question.

What do I see in man, I in myself? First, a body that is bounded by time and space, and second, a mind that realises, or dreams, it realises, a state where time and space are not. Knowledge is of truth, and truth is eternal. Conduct attains the good, and the values of the good are eternal. The true and the good refer the man to God as to the source of the Beautiful. Beauty is equally Divine. Love scoffs at death.

Man is not body alone, and not mind alone. Both are naturally ours, and both naturally, therefore, good. The well-being of the one is intimately bound up with the well-being of the other. "The brain moves: it is stark nonsense to say that the brain thinks." "Every neurosis has its psychosis." Both these statements are true. The brain is not the mind, but we cannot ignore the link between them.

The body is made up of various organs for the functions of life: the brain to accompany and condition thought, and to execute the will-commands: the circulatory system of the blood to preserve and renew the brain and the nerves: the respiratory system of the lungs to purify the blood, and the digestive to remove and replace the waste of blood and tissue. These make the individual body self-sufficient. They are enough for each one's bodily well-being.

These organs of the body function, when in good condition, in an imperceptible way. When disordered, they are often causes of acute pain and discomfort. The exception is the process of eating and drinking, which

is accompanied with more or less pleasure, that seems to serve the purpose of urging the body to labour, not only to satisfy the cravings of hunger and thirst, but also to tickle the palate with delicacies. This assures regular feeding, which is needful for the normal healthy body.

Apart from those already mentioned are the reproductive organs, male and female. They form a class apart. Wombless women and eunuchs are sometimes born, and live well and happy in their own way. Castration and ovariectomy do not destroy, or diminish health. The reproductive functions have a reference outside the individual, and connect him in various ways to others. First, by being a dual function, it demands a union between man and woman. Second, in as much as it perpetuates the race, it links the pair to all humanity, the generations past to those to be. Biology shows how intimate and real is this bond. Thirdly the child is the bond and *raison d'être* of the family, the primal cell in the national organism.

This function, believed to be ultimately destructive of the individual,—at least by many thinkers and observers,—is accompanied with the greatest of merely bodily pleasures.

Finally, a strong and deep-seated connection subsists between these reproductive organs and the great nerve centre, the brain. Excess of functioning of the former shatters the nervous system, and ends in lunacy. On the other hand, brain activity seems to stimulate the sexual instincts. Havelock Ellis conclusively es-

tablishes the close and continual action and re-action, between the religious emotions, in particular, and the sex desires. The laws that express this mutual influence have not been formulated as yet.

One point more in this general conspectus of the human body, is supplied by the thought of the inadequate self-protection of the body, making, at least for the man of modern civilisation, a modicum of clothing and shelter as great a necessity to him as his daily bread. That the human body can adapt itself to its environment, from one extreme of temperature to the other, is proved by "the naked negro panting at the line," and the equally naked Tierra-del-Fuegan woman and child seen by Darwin, as they stood undisturbed though the spray froze on their bodies as it drenched the mother and her little babe in arms.

In considering man's non-bodily nature, the old faculty, psychology, would have been of great convenience here. With its imagination, or memory, intellect and will with the phrase, *nihil in intellectu nisi quod prius in sensu*,—"there is nothing in the mind but what has been in the sensations"—to link mind and body together, this division would have supplied a very apt sub-division for the functions of the mind or soul. As it is, sense-impressions, perceptions, associations, assimilations to the Perception-mass, emotions, volitions, all working together, and inextricably fused in each and every operation, make it a hopeless task to seek for a practical guide here for the classification of the thoughts of this chapter.

Out of regard to the purely practical aim of this book, I shall employ the external division supplied by objects to classify the invisible mental processes. My aim is not psychological analysis, but an attempt to formulate admitted psychic facts. We know. We desire. We enjoy. This gives cognition, volition, emotion, corresponding to the Platonic trinity of the true, the good, and the beautiful, that I have adopted in my introductory chapter.

Cognition, and its harvest of knowledge, garnered in the memory, and transmitted to others, is, primarily a function of well-being of the individual. As it is also communicable, it enters into all human relations as the raw material of progress. It may result in mistaken knowledge, or error, when it misses the truth. It is then an equally prolific source of the germs of intellectual disease and death. The exercise of this function calls for patient persistence, and brings with it, when the truth has been attained, a contented satisfaction. Doubt is a most distressing state of mind.

Volition eventuates in action, or, when reasoned, conduct, that builds up habits of good or ill, virtues or vices, *i.e.*, character. Character, in its turn, re-acts on conduct, and makes virtue and vice yet more and more easily a part of self. The beginnings of virtue, as of knowledge, are alone difficult. In a noble-minded character, the pursuit of good calls for the most concentrated earnestness. It finds its reward in an assured happiness,—“the peace of God that passeth all understanding.” Vice is restless to the end. The

power of character to influence other men is one of the most important practical considerations connected with the thought of this mental process.

The emotions in all their complex blendings with one another, and in their infinite variety of shades, or degrees of intensity, may, perhaps, be conveniently reduced to the following heads. The division will be found exhaustive enough for all practical purposes. These various heads are *love, hate, hope, fear, and anger*. These arise accordingly as the beautiful is perceived here and now, or not here and now, or as attainable, or unattainable, or finally, as threatened by something that might destroy it. With the Infinite Beauty at stake, it is easy to understand the violence of religious emotions. It partly excuses religious enthusiasm even when it goes to extremes, as the *odium theologicum*. It expresses, at least, a sense of the infinite value of God for man. As such, it is a million times preferable to the cloddish apathy, that knows nothing worth worrying about.

In connection with the emotions it is well to mention the newly-recognised action of suggestion and telepathy. The senseless panic of a crowd is a striking illustration. Unreasoned fear spreads like a conflagration in a haystack. This unintentioned, unreasoned, uncontrolled contagion of the emotions is a strange fact worthy of consideration in estimating the value of religious fervour evoked and spread by religious revivals.

Finally, this enumeration is completed by the

mention of man's free will. It is not possible to avoid this vexed question here. As to what it is, or how it acts, that is for the philosopher to define and describe. Justice Beaman of Bombay very soundly expresses it as the "dynamic mode of consciousness." We shall attend to the practical side of the controversy. Even here there is difficulty enough to meet at the very outset.

How is man free if God fore-knows his actions, or even if they are the result of the unfolding of the divine in man. Theism and Pantheism alike seem to compel us to regard the conception as an absurdity. However, there are subtle distinctions in plenty to set against both forms of the objection. The Monotheist may be met by saying either that God fore-sees that this man will *freely* act thus or thus : or that God does not *fore-see*, as our finite conceptions compel us to describe His divine knowledge. He just sees in His eternal Now, in which there is no past, present or future. To the Pantheist, it is pointed out that the evolution of the divine in man, his spirit is independent of every thing but itself, and that, therefore, the divine in man is free. Responsibility is the natural outcome of his relations to other forms of the divine evolution, to other theandric sparks of the divine fire, to other men, in short. Such are some of the answers given. *Qui potest capere capiat.*

Here it is enough to say, that *common sense, all the world over, holds man responsible for his actions, because it credits him with reason to tell him the consequences*

of his actions. We appeal to the culprit's knowledge of the ill-results of his act, be he man or boy. "Did not you know that if you throw stones about, you might hit some one?"—"Don't you know it is wrong, *i.e.*, unnatural to tell lies?"—"Don't you know that adultery destroys the very foundations of society?" Because man is a rational animal, he is responsible. Free-will is rooted in reason, volition in cognition. "I could not help myself", is no excuse, save as regards physical coercion. The excuse, "I did not know," is valid in any court of morality. All men acknowledge, and practically accept their own accountability as a moral axiom. It is self-evident. No subtilities really shake the conviction. In these practical considerations it is the first postulate of the second part.

The social man in the family, the township, State, or race, is the outcome of the need men have of each other. Mutual succour against common enemies, mutual assistance in procuring bodily necessities in a stable and permanent manner, mutual aid in perpetuating the race by safe-guarding the child, and, above all, in securing a wider sphere for the exercise and development of his spiritual activities, all these compel men to live united and together. This, too, is for the child. The child, the heir of futurity, sole legatee of all this world, physical, mental and moral is the fountain-head of all that is not self-seeking in man.

The contrasted instincts of self-preservation and of self-sacrifice for the sake of the child tend, respectively, to the well-being of the individual and the perfecting

of the race. The latter is as natural as the former, but of wider value. The former justifies violence. The latter promulgates the law of love. As between man and man, Tolstoy maintained that the teaching of Christ was that love *alone* should rule. Cases involving a conflict of these arise as questions for solution in the second part.

There is one concluding remark to add here. It points out the purpose of the enumeration just given of man's natural functions, mental and physical, individual and social. The aim has been to indicate that the natural well-being of man depends on the perfection of just these activities. As natural, their perfection enables him to attain his end best, whatever that end might be. The *mens sana in corpor sano*—*the sound mind in the sound body*,—is thus the *proximate end of man, and the norm of his moral life*. The attainment of this well-being, this perfect realization of the self, is the standard of man's conduct. Social institutions are concrete embodiments of ever more and more complex means and facilities to this end ultimately to be fully realised only by posterity.

CHAPTER VII.

THE NATURE OF EVIL.

At the threshold of the study of the good to be realised by the religious life, hangs the dark shadow of the thought of evil. This dark figure of ill is embodied by the nations of the world in a thousand sinister shapes. Ahriman, Satan, the Prince of Darkness, and

the Father of Lies,—what is the nature of the world that he is imagined to rule ? What is evil ?

Let us enumerate a few admitted evils, and seek for a conception that shall include them all. It is possible that a man may conceive,—though not very reasonably—that it is an evil for him to be without the wings of an eagle, or the strength of a lion. Loss of sight, disease and death are some more of a second class of ills, “that mortal flesh is heir to.” Pain stands apart in a third category, and demands special consideration among bodily ills. Then there is the whole class of mental evils, dullness, slowness, lunacy, doubt, error and ignorance. Lastly, there is the strange fact of the existence of moral evils. Gluttony, lies, theft, murder, lustfulness, pride, etc., culminating in moral depravity, a bad character, constitute in the opinion of the whole wide world, the blackest stain on the beautiful works of God.

Let us take each of this haphazard list in turn, try to understand what each of them means, and so arrive at a general idea of what evil signifies.

The absence of a good, possession of which is not natural to man, is really no ill at all. It is the same thing as man's finite nature. All good is not his. Only God's infinite fullness knows of no good that is not Himself.

Loss of sight, disease, *i.e.*, loss of health, or of the sound functioning of the bodily organs, death, or the loss of life,—these are evils indeed, and in the case of death, the worst of bodily ills. Yet, in themselves,

these are nothing, mere negations, losses of something positive, of some good. These show that among the greatest of evils is the loss of a good that is natural, but they remain negations. They are not. The positive evil that should arouse our opposition is their cause. We may fear the vitriol that can blind, attack the bacilli that can set up cholera morbus, and hate the enemy who would slay us. As lost good, they are nothing, not good nor bad, but just annihilation, nothingness, non-being. Their causes are evils.

Pain is a complex product. First, there is the negation noticed above, the absence of well-being, of comfort, that marks the normal functions of life. It is acute discomfort, but it is more. It is a positive, urgent, sensation of organic reluctance. It is an instinctive struggle and effort to restore the lost comfort, and a perception of that struggle. This, thirdly, plays over into the cognitive, volitional, and emotional functions of the mental life. The emotions of fear, hate and anger, fanned to excess by the exaggerations of an uncontrollable imagination, stir the whole man into action. With all the might of his will he combats the evil cause at its destructive work. Agony is a struggle. Pain makes the work of destruction known, and so makes remedy possible. The sensation of discomfort is trifling in itself. A strong or enthusiastic emotion makes it imperceptible. In such cases Burns are not felt till an hour after they have destroyed the skin. A flogging that laid bare the ribs was mocked at by the indignation of the sufferer, who declared that he had afelt nothing of

the blows. In its effect, as an urgent cry of alarm, pain is a distinct good of the individual. The cause of the disorder, the discomfort of which culminates in pain, is the real evil.

Of mental ills, dullness and slowness of mind, are limitations of the individual, mere negations, as also is mental aberration, or lunacy. They are physiological, rather than mental, and come under the head of disease just mentioned.

Of mental evils properly so called ignorance, or absence of knowledge, doubt or dissatisfied instability of knowledge, and error or false knowledge, are again, in themselves, only negations. To compare them with bodily ills, error is intellectual disease; doubt is mental pain; ignorance is the death or non-being of cognition. They are losses of good, and we should regard as the real evil the positive causes that tend to destroy the good that knowledge brings with her.

Lastly, we come to the specimens of moral evil that were selected for consideration.

Gluttony is excessive eating and drinking in spite of the fact, that it is admitted by the glutton himself to be harmful to the digestion, and so to the whole physical well-being of the man.

Lying is a misrepresentation of facts. It produces ignorance as its normal result. In common with all forms of deception, it is cognition murder.

Theft is unjustly taking from another and without his consent, what is his possession.

Murder takes human life so as to imperil society.

at least in principle. Like theft it does harm to the individual as well as to the community.

Lust is a habit of the will that saps the real base of all social life, by being destructive of the family.

Moral depravity, the culmination of moral ills is a character so built up by conduct that its aim is no more to realize the perfections of the whole self, but merely to develop one point regardless of the rest. Owing to the unity of the human character, and the organic relations between mental functions, this ends in the destruction even of the abnormal development, with that of the whole moral man.

Evil, we thus see, is a negation, absence, loss or destruction of good. There is nothing here to oppose. What is called, and incorrectly known as positive evil, is any good, anything, faculty, power, quality, or nature that works to the destruction of any other existing good.

To imagine anything that shall destroy, or tend to destroy infinite good is to try to imagine two hostile gods. This we have seen to be inconceivable. Infinite good is unassailable. However, the finite produced by the infinite,—by creation or emanation,—is directed to an end. The means to realise this is the future well-being of the fully developed finite being, Man. Man may oppose this in two ways, either materially, *i.e., de facto*, or,—conceivably;—with formal intent to thwart the divine purpose. The supreme and self-evident folly and futility of such a conception, apart from its ineffable depravity, makes the second case a

mere logical potentiality of evil. Men, at any rate, do not resist this or that good, *because* God wills it, but *although* God wills it, not because they attend to its divine nature, but because heedless of the fact. Men seek the partial good A, and that is all they think about even if A should conflict with the good B, that tends more directly to the divinely appointed end.

To repeat, the end is, first, the perfect realization of the individual nature of each man. This tends, in its turn, to the realising of the greatest good of the greatest number in the community or state. Finally, the whole is, apparently to work out a world-wide inter-dependence in which the individual shall attain to an environment the best suited to secure for him his highest personal perfection. Thus the process rounds to the full circle of action and re-action, in which it is impossible to assign a period or stop to the indefinite continuance of progress.

What hinders the good that God wills.—freely, say the Theists: apparently and necessarily, say the Pantheist,—is moral evil. Practically, it is the deliberate attempt to hinder, or destroy, the perfection of the individual.

Hence the standard of perfection is ultimately, God's will—free or necessary,—practically, again, it is the ideal perfection of each individual *i.e.*, his nature conceived as entirely perfect, or fully realized. This involves a conscious recognition of the divinely appointed end, and its deliberate acceptance, or rejection. The former alone can bring the cognitive and voli-

tional nature of man into line with the Divine purpose, into harmony with the divine will. To those who recognise a personal God, this process is conceived as obedience to a command, and its contrary as disobedience.

Another consideration here, of real value, is a remark,—of Aristotle, I believe,—that evil is the correlative of good in the sense that good can not exist, except under conditions that make evil possible. This is as true of moral evil. The reflection meets the objection, "How can a holy God tolerate even for a moment the presence of sin in His work." It must exist as a possibility, if moral good is to be. What conditions the one, is equally the condition of the other. It is the same danger that calls forth fear, and its opposite, courage. The possibility of drunkenness makes temperance a virtue. The same physical suffering gives rise to patience, or impatience, and so on through the whole catalogue of virtues and vices. To employ the Biblical illustration, it was the tasting of one and the same fruit that brought with it the knowledge of good and evil.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL, AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

Beside the consideration above noted, satisfying, perhaps to a philosopher, the difficulty touched on at the end of the last chapter, can still be urged in other forms. It will be useful to follow out the train of thought to which this gives rise.

How can God tolerate disobedience, or permit an attempt to thwart His holy will? Can infinite holiness brook opposition? How can God allow sin? This is the first difficulty. The second arises from the consideration of material failures. The sketch given above of the end, to which the God-produced nature of the world is the means, leaves unexplained the place and part, in the cosmic plan, of the immature, the coerced, the repressed. What is the divinely appointed end of the babe that dies as it enters into the world? What realization of self is possible for the starved and em-bruted slave, dock-hand, and factory labourer?

The answer to this objection marks an important step forward. We have seen that there is an infinitely good God, that the world proceeds from Him, that its motions and actions are ascribable to Him, that the nature of a thing is its divinely appointed means for attaining that end, that other natures oppose this end by seeking their own natural perfections so that persons and things become evils to each other, and lastly that in a self-conscious mind that violates this rule of conduct appointed by God's will, we have the existence of moral evil. Moral evil is possible only among rational beings. They know, and, with forethought, neglect or refuse to act according to their knowledge, and hence they are held accountable for their acts. Self-subordinated by instincts, and not by reason, we hold them guilty. Instincts are equally from God with reason, but in man, reason is the *natural* king of the microcosm. Failing to realise this, men, as far as in them

lies, are frustrators of God's design, and yet, how often, it would seem that all is well with them. They thrive and fatten on the land. On the other hand, the faithful servant of God meets with contempt and humiliation, sufferings and even cruel death. And in addition to this moral disorder, how many countless millions live stunted, crushed and corrupted lives in violation of every natural need and instinct of their natures, with every faculty, mental and bodily, depraved and atrophied, with every spiritual aspiration dead. And what of the physically unfit, children who die undeveloped, lunatics who perish like mere animals, strong men cut off in the fullness of their promise, with that promise ruthlessly left unfulfilled. Are not these natural failures ascribable to the Author of nature?

N. B —The fact of these failures does not touch the argument from design, which was based on the perfection of the whole as a whole.

To meet this objection there is the universally accepted hypothesis of the immortality of the soul of Man. We are compelled to suppose that there is a life after the death of the body to set right the deficiencies of this present life in its details.

The basis of this hypothesis may be expressed in some such way, as follows:—Consider the amount of physical evil in the world. Think what is meant by disease, by plague, by famine, by the complicated horrors of war, too terrible to bear thinking of clearly, and the yet more terrible, because more prolonged, sufferings and degradation of the myriad poor in the great cities of the world. Then, there is intellectual

evil. Look at the helplessness of the world's greatest teachers and reformers in the presence of the world-wide ignorance and superstition that sweeps away the work of the greatest geniuses amongst them, as the sea-waves sweep away the sand-built forts that playing children rear upon the beach. And as to moral evil, listen to what Tennyson says:—

“Lies upon this side, lies upon that side,
ruthless violence mourned by the wise :
“Thousands of voices drowning his own,
in a popular torrent of lies upon lies.”

Or, again;—

“Wealth with his wines, and his wedded harlots.”
while, at the same time, “the poor in a lump is bad.”
The presence of evil everywhere, and so frequently triumphant seems to shake the very foundations of belief in God, and hence, the hope of an after-life of some sort, is as universal as the conviction that God exists.

Moreover, this belief is grounded on the most fundamental of natural instincts, *vis.*, self-preservation. It is its natural,—*i.e.*, divine,—consequence. Indeed, the universal belief in immortality is but another aspect of the ubiquitous and ever present instinct of self-preservation, resisting blindly, persistently, obstinately, the very thought of destruction. This faith is further strengthened by the cry of the heart,—the natural instinctive cry of the lover longing for those whom he knows he could love for ever, as he has loved through long and lonely years of separation after death.

Hear the simple Bible record of Jacob's dying words that sum up his whole life as a memory of the loss of Rachel. "*And as for me*, when I came from Padan, Rachel died by me in the land of Canaan in the way, when yet there was but a little way to come unto Ephrath: and I buried her there in the way of Ephrath; the same is Bethlehem." "*And as for me*",—I am a memory of that death. Nothing else has he to say of himself, one hundred and forth-seven years of age, and at the point of death, Finally, immortality is the demand of reason to rectify the disorders of moral evil. It is a natural instinct corroborated by its reasonableness. It is, therefore, of Divine origin.

The Theist must, here, hold fast to the sheet anchor of his belief in a Personal God, Who is, in some way, pleased to be interested in the work of His own hands. Man's instinctive belief in his own immortality is a proof only in conjunction with the supposition that there is a God. infinitely Good, and Just, and Holy. It ill consorts with the conception of holiness to deem that it could create *rational, emotional* beings, thrilling with love and hope, quivering with pain and fear: that it should have made death a certainty, should have led us, invincibly, by the nature we derive from Him, to crave for eternal life, and then, should have left us to die out and out, fooling us to the top of our bent, to the very last, with a bitter irony that we cannot imagine of Him, Whom, with trusting lips we call "Our Father". There is an infinitely good God Who has led men by the very nature of their

being to expect immortality: therefore, *we are immortal.*

And do not despise this proof. It gives scientific certainty, if not an insight into metaphysical truth. To the scientist, it ought to be as satisfying a conclusion as the law of gravity. Who knows what matter is? Who knows what gravity is? We accept them because they explain the universe that lies pervious to our senses. Similarly, with a good God, a Divine Providence, accepted as a working hypothesis merely, and we, too, can explain the world. Who knows what God is? Who knows what the soul is? Yet, taking them for granted, we may solve the painful riddle of life. With it chaos becomes cosmos, the farce of life an epic, evil, a probation; the atom, Man, a match for the boundless spaces revealed by the Milky Way. The scientist, at any rate, has no right to question the everlasting life of the soul, until he can supply us with a more satisfactory "working hypothesis."

To the pantheist, Man is a spark of the Divine Fire, very God of very God, destined to be merged again into the plenitude of the Godhead. It is absurd to question his eternity.

The common conclusion, *thee*, is that *all the world over, all men, and of whatsoever religion, admit an after-life to set right the moral disorders of the present.*

There are two views as to how this is done. Either a personal God adjudges to each one according to his deserts, or, the actions of men, their ill-deeds and good, have each a necessary outcome of their own. Cause


and effect, say the teachers of the latter view, are as inevitable in the moral as in the physical world, and the sum-total of life entails a Karma of good or ill, in strict proportion to the nature of the character built up by each by the conduct of his life.

The effects of these two views on conduct we shall see in the next part. The concluding words of this part are that *there is a life after death in which men shall reap the fruits of their works*. It prepares us to value the second part as we should. Righteousness is eternal life.

PART II.

THE TRUE—DHARAM.

- Chapter I.—Introductory, Religion as Subjective.
Chapter II.—Duty to Self. ✓
Chapter III.—Self and Sex.
Chapter IV.—Marriage.
Chapter V.—The Child at Home and School.
Chapter VI.—The Nation, My Neighbour and
Myself.



THE GOOD.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY—RELIGION AS SUBJECTIVE.

In the introductory chapter of the I Part, a definition of religion was laid down. This considered what religion was looked at from without, as something we were to study. We must now examine it as a personal experience of each one. We have seen what religion implied objectively. We shall proceed to look at it subjectively.

In this task the technical language of Western theology will be a great help to classify, and put order into our thoughts about natural religion. The subjective process that should accompany a natural religion is the same as in that which claims to be supernatural. If what we are now studying is a religion in any sense, even an incomplete one, it must act on the mind as religion invariably does.

Accepting, therefore, these technical theological terms, we shall call the three stages of religious experience, by the names of Revelation, Response and Regeneration. These names we shall explain and interpret so as to suit the purposes of a natural Religion.

To begin with, *Revelation* means, here, *a making known of God to man by the light of pure unaided reason.*

This is not a single historic fact vouchsafed once for all, in the year such and such to the human race

represented by some prophet chosen of God for that purpose. Moses, Christ, and Mohomed, each claims to come from converse with God, and speaks as "having authority." They claim submission of mind, heart and will from all hearers, not to themselves, but to their message. "He that heareth you heareth Me." This submission must be absolute, because it is submission to God. This allows of no discussion, or dispute, beyond that which might establish the historic fact of the divine communication. That being admitted, the only logical attitude of mind is complete and whole-hearted acceptance of the Divinely established religion. This logical claim is most defined among Roman Catholic Christians, but it has its equivalent in the supreme authority of the Bible, Koran, or Veda, among Protestants, Mohomedans, and Hindus.

Natural religion makes no such claim. It knows of no other revelation than that which reason makes to each individual of the existence of God and nature. We have seen that this in common with all human knowledge, is progressive, and differs with time and place. The gods of the cannibals and head-hunters of Borneo, and that of the philosophers of the East and West are worlds apart in what they imply to their worshippers. Yet the fact remains that each has made known to Him a God, whatsoever human form or aspect that God may wear. The idea that each man's reason has enabled him to acquire of a God is the revelation that has been made to him. The crudeness of the primitive notion is a hard-shelled acorn that

conceals within the future full-foliaged oak of a cultured man's religion, with all its countless complications of branch and twig and leaf of consequences in belief and practice too numerous to detail.

Such a revelation of God to man is a subjective fact, a personal experience, an individual concern. Such or such is what *I* hold of God, and, therefore, such and such is the course of action that devolves on *me*. The notion held may be very primitive, but the main point to be borne in mind is that the teachings of reason are progressive. Imperfect and crude ideas of God are harmful, but the only remedy is to help on the development of the idea to its natural fullness and perfection by reason and by reasoning. If there be no impatient desire to force the philosopher's God upon a savage people before its mind and environment is capable of receiving it, there need be no fear but that, in time, they will be ready and eager to rise to the full height of human culture in matters of religion, as in all else.

There is truth, good and beauty in every stage of the growth of natural religion.

"The old order changeth, giving place to new and God fulfils Himself in many ways lest one good custom should corrupt the world," by making men creatures of routine and no longer able to give a reason for the faith that is in them. Revelation is progressive, or should be so, and can be made so.

Yet again, "everyone must act according to his lights" is a common-place text, that not only expresses

the conviction that revelation is a fact of individual consciousness, but it also involves a perception of the second aspect of subjective religion, *viz.*, response. I hold this or that to be true of God, hence I am called upon to act thus and not thus. This response, to the intellectual fact that our notion of God is of such or such a type, is the reasoned outcome of a recognition of the relation that must subsist between ourselves and the God whom we know and see, even though it be "dimly, and as in a glass." This reasoned result is the natural conscience of each man. If God is All-powerful and fierce, I must propitiate him. If God be a Just and Beneficent King, I must serve Him faithfully. If God is a loving Father, I must turn to Him with the confiding, loving trustfulness of a child. If God is the lover of my soul, my attitude to Him should be all love, rejoicing to say, "I am all His, and He all mine." "My beloved to me, and I to Him" If these are but symbols of a yet more intimate relation subsisting between ourselves and Him in Whom "we live and move and have our being", and "Who is nearer to us than breathing, closer than hands and feet," than, my mood, as a reasonable result, is something yet higher than the assured blissful devotion of lover and beloved. But in all these cases, on the revelation follows a determined, practical course of action, duty and the sense of obligation.

Now, *wherever the idea of a God arises the relation that binds man to Him is seen and felt to be the greatest and the highest possible, the ultimate and absolute basis of every other conceivable relation.* For instance, God

is the author of life. If He claims the life of a child, He claims His own, and, as the devotees of Moloch offered up their little ones to death, so, when he thought that God demanded the death of his son, Isaac, Abraham felt that the claim of God stood first. The natural duty of the protection of the son by his father is second to the yet more natural duty of submission to God. Of course, in an extreme case such as this, it is of the highest moment that the claim to such an unnatural act on the part of God be established beyond the possibility of a doubt. The presumption is overwhelmingly against such an act being divinely demanded. Subjectively, however, were one to be convinced that such a demand is made of him, the fact of the subjective impression being a mistake does not take from the high moral value of such a sacrifice.

All duty is thus absolute, higher and more imperative than anything else, because it implies a reference to God. Whether God be a person or not, does not touch the supreme nature of the demands of right. The tie that holds man to God is the closest bond of all. There is not a human soul that does not feel this as a fact of his experience. The Pantheist recognises this even more strongly, if possible, than the Theist. If I am an efflux, or emanation from God, that is the most natural, reasonable and most imperatively right thing to do which will lead me to Him from Whom I came forth. For the Pantheist, too, this is the most fundamental relation of the individual. He, too, is, because God is.

To understand this better, let us suppose one to ask, "If I do not chose to do what is natural and right, what then ?" To this we reply, "Well, then, you are unreasonable, unnatural, immoral, and wrong, and you must take the consequences of being such, whatever these may be." This is sure, that to fulfil the highest demands of man's individual nature is to secure personal well-being. And this is sure because, precisely, the relation of man to God, is that which expresses his whole nature : it is that on which his whole nature depends. Man, and all the world is not, except in as much as made by God : or, if we prefer, as thought and willed by God.

"Because right is right, to follow right.

"Were wisdom in the scorn of consequence", says Tennyson. This is true because right is well-being ; wrong is destruction. That is according to man's nature, this against it, and nature is divine. Hence, for all religions, right and wrong is an absolute distinction depending on man's relation to God. On the other hand, subjectively, as men know God progressively, and never wholly, right and wrong alter with the progress of man's developing knowledge, and is relative to that progress. Duty remains always man's highest obligation, that which expresses the most imperative demands on him, his religion, his response to revelation. However, what here and now is my individual duty, or yours, depends on the nature of our idea of God.

• As remarked before, when considering God as a

person, duty is looked upon as obedience to His commands. To some the word "person," is so human in what it connotes that it cramps and hinders the fullness of the thought implied by the word "God", the Infinite Being. Indeed, an infinite person is something so different to a human person that the common term stands in as much need of correction as we saw was required by the word 'being' when employed as the name of God. However, bearing this correction in mind, we may say that God commands what is right and forbids what is wrong: that is, He commands what is the rational outcome of the nature of God, and of the nature of man in their reference to one another, and forbids the contrary. The promulgation of this command is the very coming into being and the remaining in existence of man as a rational being. In other words, by means of his reason man comes to know what he himself is, and what God is, and therefore, he also knows what is right for him to do, and what not. This promulgation is progressive, because man himself is progressing, so that his knowledge grows, as we have often said, and cannot repeat too often.

Therefore, having seen that, subjectively, right conduct is the response made to the revelation granted to each of the nature of God and of man, right conduct will be seen to build up a perfect character, a new man. This result is the crown of religion, subjectively considered, and is technically termed, Regeneration. To one regenerate,—a saint,—right conduct

becomes natural in the fullest sense of the term. He desires, pursues, rejoices in nothing but the Divine Will, the fulfilling of the divine purpose in the world, the realizing of the divine end in his own individual nature, *viz.*, his perfection.

To these three stages of religion subjectively considered, there correspond three habitudes of mind that are, in the religious language of Christianity, termed the 'theological virtues', because they refer the individual man to God.

Consequent on the revelation made to man by reason,—or otherwise,—there arises an acceptance of the truth so made known, as a vital personal concern. This acceptance is called faith. Religions that claim a supernatural origin, assert that faith is directly infused by God into the soul of man to confirm him in his belief in the teachings of the supernatural religion. Here by faith is meant no more than a clear understanding of truth with reference to God and man, and a realization of the importance of the conclusions arrived at by the reason.

Next, when the relation between God and man has been seen to be supreme, transcending time and space, absolute, there arises, as the natural response to the revelation received, the sense of duty, the loyal pursuit of the highest good. This sense of duty is further supported by a reasonable expectation that in dealing rightly with God, in fulfilling and perfecting our nature, all will surely be well with us, perhaps even when 'time shall be no more.' This reasonable expectation

is the virtue of hope. This virtue, too, by some supernaturalists is said to be a gratuitous gift of God wholly independent of any reasoning, or even of merit.

Finally, to the stage of regeneration, corresponds the virtue of charity or love. The renewed man is in perfect harmony with God and nature. To him duty is ever more and more a delight. The good and the true are known and felt to be the beautiful. The beauty of all that is divine fills the heart with peace, content and joy. The whole man loves God.

Revelation, response and regeneration; faith, hope and love act and re-act on each other in never-ending progress. We love the good God better, and we shall come to know Him more fully. We conscientiously follow the good, doing our duty to the best of our ability, and we shall both know and love God better.

Now, in all that is said above, there is no reference to a supernaturally revealed God. The mental and moral habitudes described above are found in every state of individual religious life, and just as much when the revelation has been made by reason alone.

To a Materialist, his nearest approach to the idea of God may be no more than the perfection of law and order that he beholds in all the world of science. This is all his faith and revelation. His duty in response is the study of and obedience to the physical laws that his science makes known to him. Finally, his love is but the delight that he finds in the pursuit and possession of scientific truth. All the three God-

seeking habitudes of mind are his, though merely in this narrow way.

Similarly the ascetic, or contemplative knows,—or thinks he knows,—God as operating on his mind and heart direct. This is his faith. His response is to bring himself by self-denial and concentration of mind to yet more and more of such divine experiences, holding them to be what God primarily demands of him. He, too, comes to love the God of his aspirations, as the goal of his desires. “My God and my all” is his loving ejaculation.

The Christian's God is popularly embodied in the Man, Jesus. The Christian's faith sees this ever more and more distinctly: his duty is the imitation of Christ that is rooted in the hope of attaining to a perfect union of love with Jesus.

“Jesus, Lover of my soul,

“Let me to thy bosom fly.”

Exactly in the same way, the more or less of reasoned knowledge that a man may have of God is what may be termed his natural faith. Acting in accordance with nature is duty. Such conduct relies on the hope that so doing alone is well-being attainable. Finally, there results a mind and heart in perfect harmony with nature and with nature's God, rejoicing in the beauty of the world and of its author.

Lastly, it is noteworthy that the regenerate, or new man, in relation to God will be found to possess certain distinct and marked characters in a steadily progressive scale. The traits of the lowest of these

characters will be found sublimed in the highest, and the loftiest mood will occasionally occur ennobling the least advanced of these perfected types.

Where God is conceived as Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, Judge of the living and the dead, Avenger of wrong, &c., the first emotion we feel is one of fear. But "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom", *i.e.*, of right conduct. This is the emotion of the slave, who serves so as to avoid punishment. Thus, the Christian or Mohamedan, who avoids a particular evil act on account of his fear of hell; or the Hindu who does the same to avoid the pains of a degrading re-birth that his karma might entail; or, the man who acts rightly to escape the sufferings and diseases that misconduct might bring upon him, all these alike are acting as slaves of God. Nor is this to be despised. It results in the avoidance of evil, although the disposition of the subject is still far from the heights to which it can be raised.

Next is the man who seeks the good and follows it, not from any real bent of mind towards the good, but in hope of well-being secured, in hope of a reward. The splendours of paradise of which the Koran speaks, the bliss of the beatific vision that the Christian looks for when he shall "see God face to face", the final rest and re-absorption of nirvana, or the condition of becoming *mukti*; these are all conceived of as payment for services rendered. Those to whom this motive appeals are hirelings, paid servants, and not slaves, and, in so far, higher than the former class.

The third class still shrink from duty as distasteful and hard, but these overcome their distaste, and follow the right because by so doing they carry out the will of God, whom they love. Such are like children who obey even in what they would rather not do, just to please the father, or mother, whom they love.

The final stage rarely realised fully and wholly is met when the good to be done is seen as the beautiful, and loved for its own sake. The nature of the world flows from the nature of God, and this is seen and felt to be wholly loveable. We act now, because "charity constraineth us". We act because we must, for we love and desire exactly as God desires and loves. In will, God and man become one. The symbol of this union is the real lover, loving and beloved. The *Bhagwat Gita* describes this perfect man as one who has realised his oneness with the supreme, and to whom the fruit of his works or actions is wholly indifferent. The work itself is seen to be divine. Not to avoid harm, not to secure well-being, but for the work's sake is all undertaken. The good and the beautiful are one.

To summarise, reason reveals God to man as a personal concern of the man's. This knowledge is his Faith. Faith arouses a response in man, a sense of duty, a conscience, that is stimulated to activity by the hope of attaining well-being. Religion, finally, culminates in regeneration. The man is renewed in character, built up by conduct, *i. e.*, by dutiful actions. Our relations to God as affected by religion, are those

of a slave to his lord, a servant to his master, a child to his parent, a lover to his beloved. These characters are not only successive stages, but they may co-exist, accordingly as different aspects of the infinite impress themselves upon the mind and heart.

CHAPTER II.

DUTY TO SELF.

The purpose of the Second Part is practical, hence, although Man's relation to God is the ultimate basis of Duty, and the source of the absolute nature of the obligation, practically, duties to self and other men are of more frequent occurrence. Duty to God is rather a constant disposition, mood or attitude of mind which colours or affects all our actions. That which builds up habits of virtue or character, most rapidly is that which calls forth the greatest number of daily acts. Moreover, self-regarding acts are usually under the influence of physiological forces, and are therefore often violent in their action, powerful in their effects, and far-reaching in their consequences. These are some of the reasons for commencing with the study of Duties to Self.

However, it must not be forgotten, that "Duty stern daughter of the voice of God," remains always expressible as a Divine command. Whether we eat or drink we may do all because they are right and natural, because they are known to be God's will. Because we believe in God, hope in Him, and love Him we are bound to perform the duties He has appointed for us.

whether their object be ourselves, others, or God.

With this borne in mind, we shall take up the primary duties of Man, first, considering him as a whole; second, as regards his body; thirdly, as regards his mind.

First, are Man's duties to himself taken as a whole. In this connection it is necessary to emphasise Man's individual nature. He is himself. No one else, however similar is just exactly the same as he. An *alter ego* is a myth. However, to decide in what this individuality consists is one of the most subtle metaphysical questions. The opinion that sees the essence of individuality in the fact of special adaptation to a definite end assigned to each by God is consistent with our former considerations. What this end may be God alone knows. But each separate individual should take stock of himself, with all his abilities, his environment, his relations to all around him so as to form as adequate an idea as possible of what he really is, and is capable of becoming that he might make the most himself.

It is a satisfying thought to be convinced that I, and I alone, am capable of realising a certain definite purpose of the Divine Mind. If I fail, I mar, as far as in me lies, the Divine plan. This is a tremendous thought, and not the less so though I should at the same time perceive that the infinite complexities of life are quite capable of providing countless substitutes for me and for my work. A particular blood-vessel serves as an artery for the leg, but if it should be severed, and the ends surgically closed, other vessels grow to the size

required to do its work. So no man is absolutely necessary, though each is adapted for a special and singular purpose. That singular purpose is, in a definitive way, to further a wider end. To that, however, there are other means should this particular one fail.

The above reflection, first of all, serves to make clear the immorality of Suicide. The same, moreover was abundantly clear, also from all that has been said regarding the end of Man being his self-realization and perfection.

The second practical outcome of the above is to make each man take himself seriously, literally for God's sake. The virtue that realises this is Self-Respect. The lowest slave or menial has a part to play in the Divine drama of human life, equally with the monarch on the throne, or the priest at the altar.

A further result is the rational conviction that personal failure to attain the end of life must entail a loss of well-being. We feel that, in some way or other, we shall and should suffer for it. No man can bear such a thought. He fears it, and so the emotional part of man steps in to support the conclusions of reason. This is the Fear of the Lord that is the beginning of wisdom referred to in the last chapter.

The same belief results also in what is described as putting ourselves into the hands of God to do with as He pleases. Resignation to the Divine will is the passive aspect of the virtue, the active side of which is the determination to make the most of ourselves. The advice of Mohamed, "to work as if there were no God,

and to pray as if God had everything to do and we nothing," admirably expresses the twofold consequence of this consideration.

The preceding thought is also the source of what is somewhat ambiguously insisted on as the Equality of Man, and the duty of Fraternity which is the practical recognition of that equality. This requires further thought. Men, in qualities of mind and body, in opportunities of development, and in the purpose they eventually fulfil, are, emphatically, *not* equal. The stern and rigid regulations of Hindu caste are a practical and social assertion of the fact.

This man is a fool and an idler; that man is a pains-taking genius. This one is born to wealth and power and the loving care of hundreds; that other is a base-born child of sin, heir to poverty and disease. One succeeds to all the treasures of modern civilisation; another is a naked savage in the heart of Africa. These are not equal. Yet each has his place to fill, *i.e.*, his help to give towards the general progress of the world, even if he have no more to do than to accept the good when it comes before him. This is not the place to examine how far such inequalities are right or wrong, how far inevitable or not. The fact is that men are not even born equal. Those who assert the equality of man mean that all men have a right to equal opportunities for self-realization and development. The ground of his claim is his knowledge that as a human being he has specifically the same attributes and qualities of body and mind that belong to his

fellow men.. Hindu caste does not recognise this as valid, nor does the practice of Europe. From Man's equality with other of his species springs his right to be free to perfect himself as far as he is subject of improvement. This is Man's right to Liberty. From the equal right to freedom, and from the fact that he is nor more nor less than man, be he prince or pauper, comes the sense of the Brotherhood of Man. In the sense just explained, men, considered as individuals of the same species may employ the watchwords of the French Revolution, "Liberty, Fraternity and Equality". This is the sole fact that they express. That all men are equal in all respects, with exactly similar rights and privileges is a mis-statement of fact. It is worse. It is an impossibility, As expressing the ideal, aspiration and hope that all men should reach the height of their individual capabilities it is a help towards the universal development of mankind, and a motive power to push the world forward to the realization of the dream. How the world's progress is affected by it will be examined later. Here the thought of the equality of men is taken as the foundation of Self-respect that is wholly compatible with Loyalty and Obedience, where such recognition of self subordination is due.

Secondly, Men should attend to the development and right functioning of his body and its organs.

The externals necessary to this end are shelter, clothing, and food. As regards these three, nature, or God, leaves men wholly unprovided, and yet they are

necessaries. This points clearly to the duty of work, that shall supply men with these things that his bodily existence demands. This curse of work, as some have described it, is in common with all duties, a blessing and a joy of the highest order. The instinct of self-preservation steps in to compel men to work. It is only those who seek to escape from this law of their being who find that work is a burden. To those who undertake it manfully, it becomes an engrossing interest, and, eventually, a source of unstinted satisfaction and delight. What is here said of self-seeking work is yet more true of work for the sake of the family, the State ;—but of that in due course.

So great is the regenerating effect of true, earnest, honest labour, that it has been by some modern writers, looked upon as a panacea for all the ills of human society. The Gospel of Work, as this teaching has been called, has the support of the greatest names in recent literature, among whom the name of Carlyle is not the least.

Menial, manual work, mother's work, student work equally with the highest labours of statesmen and great public leaders all are an unmixed pleasure when frankly undertaken and faithfully executed. The duty of work is a joy. Industry, Diligence, Perseverance, are virtues, or mental habits corresponding to this duty, and are, of course, as necessary for social as for self-regarding work.

As regards bodily health, the digestive functions are of primary importance. The quantity and quality

of food taken both demand special consideration on account of their effects on the health of the body. Experience soon shows the advantage of moderation in both eating and drinking. In primitive times when man lived by hunting, and food was procurable only at irregular intervals, orgies of excess followed by long periods of enforced fasting formed the normal condition of human life. It has, however, been established that regularity and moderation in food and drink are of the first importance in assuring the most healthful bodily state.

The virtue of moderation in these matters is called Temperance. The most common sin, or wrongdoing opposed to it is Gluttony, i.e., excessive devotion to eating and drinking. The word Intemperance is used in a narrower sense. It then means excessive indulgence in intoxicating liquors, or drugs. Most established religions prescribe Fasting as a salutary practice. Its value to restore the body to a sound condition after excesses is undeniable. It finds a physical justification in the compulsory fastings of primal man. Whether the same 'good results from fast at prescribed seasons needs no defence here. Such disciplinary actions and penances have their regulations grounded on other considerations than those of mere nature.

The drink habit, with its temporary alienation of Man's noblest faculty, his reason, and its lasting ill effects on the constitution, stands naturally condemned. The most casual glance around the world

will reveal the horrible and needless sufferings that this vice entails, and very often on innocent women and children. It is hard to speak calmly of this evil, the most brutalizing and degrading of the sins of men. A drunkard is an abject wretch in himself, a source of disease and misery to his children, and a leprous spot in society. God have mercy on those who are bound by family ties to the drunkard. He shows none.

However it is just to state, that where the habit of drink has become established, the condition of the drunkard calls for medical rather than moral aid. The diseased state of the body then makes alcohol a necessity. Hereditary predispositions are also much of an excuse. In these cases submission to a good doctor is the course that a right conscience will dictate.

Entirely similar is the case of those who have formed the habit of using various harmful drugs. Opium, morphia, arsenic, bhang, ganja, &c.,—their name is legion,—are more frequently used among Hindus than wine and spirituous liquors, which are a more expensive form of intoxication. Even smoking is capable of being carried to excess, and becoming a vice.

Again, to make sure of a sound body, regular exercise should be taken to promote a healthful circulation of the blood, and attention paid to obtain as much pure air as possible for the lungs, and pure water for drink and ablutions. These are all equally needful. From this need arises the duty of Cleanliness, and Attention to Sanitation.

This is primarily a duty of Communities. It is the individual's part to attend to his own share of the task of maintaining cleanly surroundings.

The moral aspect of this question, the thought that it is a duty Man owes to himself and others, based on the very nature of his bodily existence has been entirely overlooked by moralists. There has even been "a dirty saint". This, however it might be justified supernaturally is unnatural and wrong. Common sense asserts this in the proverb, "Cleanliness is next to godliness". The exaggerated fussiness on this point that Tolstoy condemns as a sign of inordinate luxury is far from what is here advocated, viz., the cleanliness that is beneficial to health. No where is it needful to insist on this point so much as in the East, where the tropical sun engenders typhus and cholera so virulently wherever insanitary conditions prevail. But among Hindus in ancient times, as among the Jews and higher Hindu castes today, attention to this matter was a religious duty. The changed conditions of modern city life may make the old sanitary prescriptions and precautions out of date and impracticable, but the spirit of these old regulations is a living fact. A man is as much bound not to poison the air for himself and others now-a-days, as in the time of Moses and Manu.

will reveal the horrible and needless sufferings that this vice entails, and very often on innocent women and children. It is hard to speak calmly of this evil, the most brutalizing and degrading of the sins of men. A drunkard is an abject wretch in himself, a source of disease and misery to his children, and a leprous spot in society. God have mercy on those who are bound by family ties to the drunkard. He shows none.

However it is just to state, that where the habit of drink has become established, the condition of the drunkard calls for medical rather than moral aid. The diseased state of the body then makes alcohol a necessity. Hereditary predispositions are also much of an excuse. In these cases submission to a good doctor is the course that a right conscience will dictate.

Entirely similar is the case of those who have formed the habit of using various harmful drugs. Opium, morphia, arsenic, bhang, ganja, &c.,—their name is legion,—are more frequently used among Hindus than wine and spirituous liquors, which are a more expensive form of intoxication. Even smoking is capable of being carried to excess, and becoming a vice.

Again, to make sure of a sound body, regular exercise should be taken to promote a healthful circulation of the blood, and attention paid to obtain as much pure air as possible for the lungs, and pure water for drink and ablutions. These are all equally needful. From this need arises the duty of Cleanliness, and Attention to Sanitation.

This is primarily a duty of Communities. It is the individual's part to attend to his own share of the task of maintaining cleanly surroundings.

The moral aspect of this question, the thought that it is a duty Man owes to himself and others, based on the very nature of his bodily existence has been entirely overlooked by moralists. There has even been "a dirty saint". This, however it might be justified supernaturally is unnatural and wrong. Common sense asserts this in the proverb, "Cleanliness is next to godliness". The exaggerated fussiness on this point that Tolstoy condemns as a sign of inordinate luxury is far from what is here advocated, viz., the cleanliness that is beneficial to health. No where is it needful to insist on this point so much as in the East, where the tropical sun engenders typhus and cholera so virulently wherever insanitary conditions prevail. But among Hindus in ancient times, as among the Jews and higher Hindu castes today, attention to this matter was a religious duty. The changed conditions of modern city life may make the old sanitary prescriptions and precautions out of date and impracticable, but the spirit of these old regulations is a living fact. A man is as much bound not to poison the air for himself and others now-a-days, as in the time of Moses and Manu.

It is, therefore, the duty of every one to suggest, promote, and publish every Municipal and Panchayet rule tending to secure better sanitary and hygienic

conditions. The insufferable habit of the lower classes of micturating at their own doorstep is a disgraceful disorder that should be put a stop to at all costs, and by every means, by ridicule and scorn, by exhortation and reproach, and, if need be, by punishment. Those who are acquainted with the conditions of life that make such a dirty habit a convenience, and apparently a necessity, will also know how to meet the difficulty, and suggest suitable remedies.

Lastly, there is the health of the nervous system and the brain to be attended to so as to get at the best results possible for the right functioning of this the highest and most developed of the bodily organs. It depends, largely, for its well-being, on pure air and sound digestion, so that this thought supplies a further motive for the virtues of Temperance and Cleanliness. It suffers, first from excessive and unnatural methods of study, where much is committed to memory without that systematizing of knowledge that follows from assimilating what is learnt to what is already known. Unintelligent cram causes brain fag.

Want of control over the emotions or even a persistent and haunting thought is a worry that is very common at the present day. This, too, causes mental fatigue and failure.

Lastly, this the highest, as it is termed, of the bodily functions, suffers from excess in what has been called the lowest and most degrading, viz., those of reproduction. As a whole, we may remark that a healthy brain presupposes a healthy body. We secure

a sound mind by making certain of a sound body, as the first condition.

The employment of the most recent methods of study based on the teachings of physiology, and the development of will power, as indicated by Psychology, are thus duties for those who have the means of books and leisure to work out the schemes of self-realization outlined in such works as Hamerton's Intellectual Life, Blackie's Self-Culture, &c. Practical considerations, however, show that the application of such methods must be restricted to the leisured classes. Others must make the most of the opportunities that the common round of daily business-life may bring within their reach. How this may be done is too detailed a matter to be more than alluded to in a work like this that merely lays down general principles of action. Learn all you can, how you can, and from whomsoever you can. A man's life is moulded by his thoughts and ideas.

To recapitulate, Man's duties to himself have the largest share in the formation of character, in as much as they involve the most frequent acts of right conduct.

The thought of his individuality directed by God to a definite end implies the condemnation of Suicide, and the obligation of Self-realization. From this also follows the duty of Self-respect and Resignation to God. Finally, Liberty to do the right and Equal claim to justice constitute the Brotherhood of Man as far as this consideration takes us.

The need of food, shelter, and clothing entails the saving duty of Work. Temperance and Cleanliness are inculcated by the nature of bodily health; and Intellectual Culture by the nature of a human knowledge. All these should be attended to if one would make the most of himself.

Sex demands a separate chapter.

CHAPTER III.

SELF AND SEX.

We concluded the last chapter with a reference to what is usually considered the highest of Man's physical aptitudes, and the corresponding duty of brain Culture. This chapter deals with what is commonly believed to be the lowest. This distinction is however, not supported by the facts of the case. Sex organs and the nervous matter of the brain are equally material, their functions equally natural, their existence equally due to the Divine Author of life. Motherhood is universally a glory and a joy, and yet the act on which it depends is almost everywhere a shame, a deed of darkness, and, among certain Catholics, the all but inevitable cause of sin. Phallic worship is an emphatic and exaggerated assertion of the contrary truth. The degradation of Sex is a great error, and a source of much evil. Man sits in judgment on the works of God, and declares the process of creation, 'bad.'

It is strange that this view should have become so prevalent. How can that be evil in which man and woman co-operate with God,—or with God-created

nature,—to perpetuate his noblest work. *viz.*, human life? It is not because evil, but because so essentially good, that it is one of the highest of duties to safeguard sex relations by every human means available. This conviction has fenced it with all manner of religious and social restrictions and regulations. This is worth bearing in mind. It is not an evil, but a good intimately personal, and bound up with the most sacred duties of Man, whether individual or social, that is too precious a private possession to be exposed to the vulgar gaze.

Once convinced of this, it will be seen that the right mood in which to approach this matter, is grave earnestness, as befits its importance. Silly, mock modesty is as out of place as lewd jesting. A word or two, therefore, to emphasise the gravity of these present considerations is urgently needed in view of the prevailing unreasoned and unreasonable state of mind with which this subject is approached.

The first remark is that the future existence of the human race depends entirely on the way in which the duty of Reproduction is fulfilled.

Secondly, all human society, whether for purposes of State, business transactions, or friendly and mutually beneficial intercourse, turns, directly or indirectly, on this question.

Next, it is the origin and mainstay of family life. The welfare of children is bound up with it.

Lastly, the happiness of the individual himself, and his health, physical, mental, and moral, result from

the way in which he is able to perfect his nature in this regard.

This last is the point to be specially attended to here. The organs of reproduction are for reproduction. Used otherwise, they are used unnaturally, and so, wrongly. Considered only with regard to this end, it is natural, and therefore right for any man and any woman to reproduce their species should they so desire it. Other considerations equally natural restrict the exercise of this right to much narrower limits. Of these we shall hear more presently.

Unfortunately there is such a thing as solitary pleasure to be extracted from these organs. This is evidently unnatural and wrong. It is a dangerous self-indulgence. This natural desire is the strongest of all bodily cravings, and its satisfaction accompanied with much pleasure. In cases of self-abuse, the craving by indulgence grows intenser, and as habit is formed, harder to resist. On the other hand, the accompanying pleasure diminishes. Now, this bodily function, even when naturally performed, is, probably, harmful to the individual. It is primarily altruistic, and not egoistic. In the normal form it accompanied by a self-forgetting mutual love between the man and woman. This controls the exercise of this function, and keeps it within due bounds. In the unnatural form of self-abuse it steadily breaks down the nervous system. It may culminate in lunacy. This is a calm and sober statement of a fact of daily medical experience. It also effects the ruin of personal happiness

and character. It makes the unfortunate wretch shun all human beings, women as much as men. He becomes quiet, inactive, self-centred. He believes his unnatural sin is a dead secret. It is stamped upon his face, revealed by his shrinking eye, and published by his every movement. He seeks more and more of isolation, indulges more freely in his vicious habit, and he dies, often enough, in the lunatic asylum.

The cure for this is anything that will distract the mind, prayer, manly exercise, work to secure a decent home, and the use of God's precious gifts as right in the social institution of marriage.

The origin of this vice is often the fact that the use of sex as so misrepresented as a horrible sin, while at the same time it is felt to be altogether natural ; is so entirely avoided by parents in their talks with their children that it has to be learnt as a wicked but pleasureable secret from servants or bad companions.

Such is the cause of this sin among children and growing young persons. In adult life, the great difficulties in the way of marriage in the present artificial condition of Society, drive the more timid to this solitary sin.

But yet greater evils follow from what I have, not quite correctly, called artificial Society. These are Sodomy, Fornication, and Adultery. A few words on each are here necessary.

The worst of these evils would seem to be Sodomy. Where one man abuses another to find a vent for his passions the unnaturalness of this vicious act is patent.

Here as before, the natural or rightful cravings of Man being artificially checked, they break out in unnatural ways. Sexual desires are a natural and a holy thing, but cut off from female society and the sacred emotion of love for a woman, a man's natural instincts assert themselves, and take to unnatural substitutes. Hence the normal appetites of the body and the sacred emotions of the soul are both woefully corrupted by this breaking loose of the unnaturally dammed up passions of the human heart.

Its evil consequences are as grave as those of Self-abuse, with the addition of the punishment attached to Fornication, *viz.*, syphilis. Moreover, this vice being destructive to the well-being not only of the individual, but also of Society, it is put down with a strong hand by the State as a most serious public offence, or crime, punishable if I mistake not, with a long term of rigorous imprisonment.

Modern Society dooms an ever increasing number of her sons to employments of such sort as make marriage impossible. The army, the navy and all the lower ranks of middle class employ do not allow of young men marrying. They are prevented from enjoying the pleasures and comforts of the sexual relation in the natural form of home life, and they take to the unnatural substitute of Fornication. It is only the very strongest wills that are roused by the presence of difficulties to determined effort to achieve the means of securing a happy home. These are noble exceptions.

Fornication, as regards the man, is, in itself a

natural act, inasmuch as there is no obstacle on his part to the attainment of its legitimate end of conception and children. It is unnatural for him, in so far as he shuns the responsibilities that the act should entail of a husband and a father. The vice on the part of the woman is unnatural even from the point of view of self-regarding duties. Sexual intercourse with many men is believed to prevent conception. Often, however, conception is deliberately checked and when it occurs the living embryo child is murdered.

The evil that overtakes such a vicious life is, for the man, the probability of infection with venereal diseases too horrible to describe. For the woman, there is in addition, premature old age and death.

How horribly these diseases punish this sin, and constitute a veritable death-in-life, a visit to any public hospital will reveal in all its repulsive truth. God's Will, The working of Nature, is rejected in the form in which it brings untold happiness, and it asserts itself as punishment. "Nature when disobeyed, never forgives", said the scientist Huxley. In this sense, too, all medical experience conclusively establishes the saying of the Bible, "And the wages of sin is death".

Adultery, considered only with reference to the individual's bodily well-being, is no wise unnatural, is no sin. The sin, the violation of nature, or Divine Law, shows itself in the ruin that it works in the natural, social institution, the family, and especially in the harm it does to the children. This evil deed is, therefore, more correctly speaking a crime, and, as such

subject to State law and social ostracism, both of which condone, and even connive at self-abuse and prostitution.

Adultery, is, besides, an infringement of another man's hard-earned rights,—rights, too, that, as said above, Society maintains and defends.

But the harm to the children most of all constitutes this an unnatural act or sin. The adulterer and adulteress are guilty of failing in almost the first of all duties that they owe to others, inasmuch as they prove themselves unnatural parents.

So far we have studied the naturalness or unnaturalness, the right and wrong of unchastity, judging from its bodily effects. Before leaving this subject it will be necessary to re-consider all that has been said above, in the light of its effects on the whole religious Man, on the perfection of his self-realization, his character, his regeneration. This we shall presently proceed to do, but before leaving the purely physical aspect of those acts, it is necessary to say a few words on Modesty, Chastity, and Celibacy from the same physical stand-point, and again with reference to character-building later on.

These virtues have received the highest praise from most religious teachers as constituting the crown and flower of a more than humanly, perfect character,—angelic and Divine in a special way, by so much the more spiritual as they are independent of the body's merely animal cravings. From the point of view of supernatural ends to which they may lead the soul of

Man, the praises of Chastity and Celibacy may possibly be fully merited. So it is taught by some religions that claim to be revealed to a higher faculty than reason. Natural Religion, however, knows nothing of the super-rational. To such a religion, and to Reason alone, all this praise is inexplicable,—quite possibly, because the teachings of Reason, on this point, have not as yet attained to so full a knowledge of human nature as to be able to understand how far this super-animal state is a gain to the character of the rational animal, Man. Natural Religion must be progressive, and that means incomplete, and capable of correction and development. Nay, more, that there should be a reasonable basis for the praise given to this “pearl among virtues”, is what we should expect, considering the universality of the honour in which this virtue is held. This admission must not be lost sight of in reading what follows.

Judging from the physical stand-point alone, in the first instance, Natural Religion holds that Modesty and Chastity, Celibacy, Widowhood and Virginity err as much by defect as the vices just referred to err by excess. This calls for explanation.

First Modesty, in a girl or boy is undoubtedly as attractive as it is a natural state of mind. Sex relations are for reproduction alone, and the children to be will be healthy and well-born, only when the parents are not too young, or too old. An instinctive and violent opposition to and shrinking from any obtrusion of sexual matters is as natural in a healthy

growing girl, as a strong sense of shame-faced reserve is the natural disposition of a boy. It is Nature's protection against too early maternity. Unnatural customs, like child-marriage, or the company of vicious elders can kill this Modesty, but it is a decided loss of one of the most charming of the natural graces of youth. In the marriageable maiden, or the young man on the look out for a wife Modesty may become an affectation and a lie. When deliberate, it is unnatural and wrong. When unconscious, or due to mistaken education it is a folly and a misfortune. As affectation it is termed prudery. Due to unnatural want of knowledge of what is implied by sex,—as not uncommon among European girls,—it is called Innocence. It is really Stupidity and Ignorance.

Celibacy, or the state of total abstinence from the pleasures of matrimony, and the obligations of parenthood, is not natural, and, therefore, wrong, unless justified by some other natural demand with which matrimony is incompatible, *e.g.*, certain intellectual pursuits that require all the energies of a man so that he has none to spare for the exacting claims of wife and children, or religious duties that may call upon a man to devote his whole life to the service of his fellowmen.

Enforced virginity, as met sometimes, among Catholics of former times, and enforced widowhood as found among most high caste Hindus, inasmuch as enforced, is a cruelty, and an injustice, immoral and sinful from every point of view.

Where voluntary, widowhood may be excuseable, and even good, if inspired by natural and true feeling.

The high repute of the virtue of Chastity, which is the habit of mind corresponding to Celibacy, is probably due to the paramount importance of preserving family relations inviolate and intact, and safeguarding it from the evils of fornication and adultery. Hence it was advisable to encourage, by every means of praise, honour and reward, the state of mind that made sexual self-indulgence an impossibility. Another reason that justifies the high position given to this virtue will be seen presently when considering the effect of sex and the duties connected with it, on the formation of character.

Here, to understand fully the evil moral effects of unchaste sins, it is necessary to premise one most important fact. This fact is the power of the Imagination. At the period of life when manhood and womanhood is definitely attained the reproductive instincts assert themselves strongly, and act on the mind and will, principally through erotic imaginings. These are to a large extent unavoidable, natural and right. In the healthy state; they urge the Man to work for the means to realize his desires. They similarly impel the woman to attract the Man. So far, so good; but if the unnatural vices above mentioned are indulged in the imaginings continue with ever-increasing urgency till the whole man turns to unnatural desires and acts. These, at best, dominate the mind of man so as to leave him no rest to turn to in-

tellectual pursuits, no energy of will to work out his desires. Mind, heart, and body suffer. and the man becomes a failure from every point of view. Usually, long prior to the actions that reason condemns are committed the mind and will have been misemployed in unlawful because unnatural, imaginations. When a sudden impulse to an unnatural act surprises the man to what his calmer moments regret, there is less harm done than in the silent watches of the night when the process of degeneration goes steadily on, and, sometimes, makes him an inevitable victim of vicious habits long before the first overt act has opened his eyes to the evil of his ways. In this matter, as in anger, imaginations are of incalculable effect for good or ill. Hence the warning of all moralists to avoid even the thought of these sins. "I have made a covenant with *mine eyes* that they should not *think* upon a virgin" was the patient Job's safeguard against fornication.

These considerations are a plea for Modesty, even among those about to marry, and among the married as regards all the world except their own consorts. Modesty restricts the supply of fuel to the fire of the Imagination, and the imagination is the proximate cause of unchastity.

Again, abstinence from all sexual indulgence, and chiefly, from indulgence in erotic imaginings gives the will an enormous power over the processes that stamp themselves upon the brain, build up habits of thought, emotion, and action, that finally result in Character. If such is the cerebral process in other matters, so that

it has been said, " We learn to skate in summer, and swim in winter, " on account of the persistence with which the imagination rehearses the motions to be performed when the time shall come, much more so is this the case with the natural acts that are the expression of this the most powerful of the instincts of living creatures. A strong character is therefore naturally built up by controlling this instinct. Hence, Celibacy is a *conditio qua-non* of all religions that demand concentration of thought, and energy of will in the pursuit of their ideals. The monastic institutions of Catholicism and Buddhism, and the Brahmacharya of the highest Hindu castes are examples of the practical application of this fact.

The fact also shows how absurd is the practice of so many who act upon the assumption that Chastity is a bodily condition, confounding it with maidenhood. This is quite false. Chastity, like every other virtue, is a mental habit. Virginity and Widowhood, when compulsory, are no more virtuous states, than the passive endurance of beasts of burden is the virtue of patience or obedience. Intact bodily conditions *may* exist along with a thoroughly corrupted mind.

To repeat in brief, Sex involves nothing sinful but on the contrary is one of the greatest gifts of a good God. The acts unnaturally opposed to reproduction are sinful and vicious. Musturbation ruins the individual, mind, heart and body, Sodomy is yet more harmful. Fornication, and its systematic expression as Prostitution, is dangerous to the man, and death to the woman.

It also strikes at the root of family life, though indirectly. This is directly done by Adultery, that violates the rights of children as well. It is therefore a public crime.

Modesty, Chastity, Celibacy, may be sins of omission. Modesty is natural in childhood and useful in the matrimonial state. Celibacy is, at times, useful to the individual, and to his work in Society. Chastity being the habit of mind that keeps the imaginations controlled in matters dealing with sex, is naturally honoured as safeguarding family life.

The ill effects of the opposite vice, through morbid imaginings, are principally moral, in the corruption of mind and heart that they produce. Less harm is done by overt acts. Chastity is a mental habit, and not a bodily state.

CHAPTER IV.

MARRIAGE.

In the consideration of the duties of the conjugal state, we must bear in mind that family life is a natural growth, and, therefore, ultimately of Divine origin. The specific forms of this growth have not been the same in different countries, and at different times. Hence, no hard and fast declaration of what is suitable under one form can be affirmed to be binding as a moral obligation on those whose social customs are of a wholly different stamp.

The family is a social institution, and such institutions are embodiments of national aspirations and ideals.

The family is the most fundamental or all such expressions of national aims. In the opinion of the whole world the entire public weal is most intimately bound up with the family. Violation of the sanctity of the home is everywhere looked upon as certain eventually to bring about the ruin and degeneration of the whole people.

Seeing things by the light of reason alone, we must take things as they are as of sufficient value to demand study in the true scientific spirit. This reason must explain, if possible, their origin, and, above all, discover the laws of their development and well-being. Human beings have set about realizing self-perfection as fully as possible in very many different ways. They have endeavoured to fulfil their duties as they have conceived them. The standard that is to determine our judgment of these methods must be the amount or degree, of self-realization that they procure.

We have, therefore, to inquire what reason approves of in family life. What is the origin of the family? What natural need is it meant to satisfy? To make the problem easier of solution, it will be as well to put the question in a concrete form. What does a man, or a woman desire, or their parents for them, when they prepare to accept the obligations of matrimony? Children, the end of the married life, is *not* the first thought, except when some religion intervenes to emphasise that, and that alone, should be the purpose and intention of those who would enter upon the married life. It is undoubtedly its ultimate purpose.

Nature, however uses the sex instinct as the means to that end. The parties concerned attend chiefly to the promptings of the instinct. The child is accepted "as the consequence of the manœuvre."

Where the choice is freely made, the process seems to be as follows. The man seeks, vaguely, the satisfaction of his reproductive instincts, at first, purely as a self-regarding matter. A similar state of mind is to be found in the woman. Circumstances lead the man to suppose that this or that particular woman, by her beauty, character, social position, &c., will enable him to realize his wishes agreeably in a stable union. Meeting with a favourable response to his overtures, desire, encouraged by hope, and made kindly by gratitude, is at last transformed into Love. Similar emotions arise in the woman. This Love is no longer self-seeking. It gradually becomes a real regard for the other, superior to all other emotion. "Love is stronger than death." A strong love, "at first sight," is an exception.

In cases where marriage is arranged by parents, nine times out of ten, the life-giving stream of Love flows into the channel prepared for it.

This birth of Love is a very important moral phenomenon. It is the first expression of an instinct that is altruistic, or other-regarding. Its consequences are as momentous. Through Love the house becomes a home. Love guarantees a welcome to the helpless babe, when it arrives. Such is the result among the higher animals. I have known a monkey freely and

unhesitatingly sacrifice its life to save his little one and its mother.

Among human beings the longer period of helplessness of the little one demands that the family bond shall be permanent. The mother's energies are to be wholly devoted to the care of her children. It is necessary that the father provide for both mother and child. This is the process that results in the family. This, too, is the natural condemnation of Divorce, except as a make-shift, replacing a greater evil by a lesser one.

On the other hand, the sexual instincts of the man, especially in tropical countries, are sorely exercised at having no outlet throughout the long period of gestation, nursing, and, at times even after this, in the case of ailing children. Hence, where the ideal of chastity is ignored, its moral influence disregarded, and self-repression considered unmanly and unnatural,—wrong,—all manner of corruptions are threatened from the unlawful forms of self-indulgence referred to above. The havoc that these produce in the monogamic family is counteracted by the institution of polygamy, especially in places where women are more numerous than men. The natural, or Divine end of marriage is the production and up bringing of well-born children, and, as polygamy secures this end, from the point of view of natural religion, it is quite as right and good a social institution as Monogamy.

Polyandry, where a woman is joint wife to all the brothers of a household, is an abnormal state now only found among certain hill tribes where

the supply of women is strictly limited. It need not, here, take up much room, as it perpetuates the evil it was intended to overcome. Such unions are rarely prolific, and therefore stand condemned as unnatural. To reason, it can, at best, be but a temporary makeshift doomed to extinction with the advance of civilisation.

The chief obstacle, in modern times, to the contracting of marriage is want of means to support a family. This difficulty has been largely met by the Hindu custom,—adopted, I believe, by the Parsis,—of what is called the Joint Family. This institution consists of all the families of brothers and cousins clubbing their earnings together under the control and management of the eldest member. This system, which Europeans, who know of it only in theory, sometimes find so admirable, is showing signs of breaking up before the example of the greater freedom of the more individualistic form of the single family. It is still, however, almost universal in India, and has much in its favour. It is the continuation down to modern times of the patriarchal family system. Whether it will continue to survive under modern conditions is difficult to say. At any rate it is the best preventive, so far as I know, of the terrible evil known as Racial Suicide.

Racial Suicide, as the name implies, is the gradual dying out of a people by means of their own actions. Under the stress of modern competition, and the greater comforts and luxuries of material civilisation to which men have become accustomed, the cost of living is

daily more and more difficult to meet. The poorer classes can no longer afford the luxury of children, nor find the time to look after them. This is the case throughout the more advanced parts of Europe. As a consequence, people enter into the married state with the unnatural purpose of preventing the conception of children. This is evidently immoral, wrong. Its advocates urge that the bringing of children into the world to struggle all their lives long with poverty and starvation is equally unnatural and cruel. The answer is that the world is still wide enough to maintain a growing population, that the gradual elimination of the unfit in the struggle for life will eventually secure the survival of the fittest, and that struggle of some sort or other is the natural condition of all life, and, finally, that this restriction of population will seriously handicap the race that accepts it in any form in the great struggle of the future when the time of over-crowding shall at last arrive. As to the fact that people are starving in any given country, this is an indictment of the Government where it occurs. Not a smaller population, but a more equable division of the means of livelihood is the remedy. But that is a problem of politics, and not of religion or ethics.

Whether when the world shall be full it will be needed to regulate the birth-rate or not, is a question that may be safely left to the future to decide. Human reason may be trusted to solve the problem of what is the natural thing to do in any given case. At present the restriction of the birth-rate is often based on

the cowardly shirking of the responsibilities of family life. The women of many large towns of Europe are as unnatural in their shrinking from motherhood as the men from fatherhood. It is a consolation to reflect that their action is automatically remedied by nature, and ends with them, and that they leave no children to inherit their cowardly disposition. God, or nature, thus keeps the future for true men and women, who like their parents will glory in parenthood. Thank God that the nations of the East have not as yet arrived at such a pass, and still serve as an object lesson meeting growing population with greater thrift. Eastern nations all glory in parentage. There, at any rate, childlessness is still a misfortune if not a disgrace. Of such is the kingdom of the future.

We shall now proceed to the study of the duties that the family, in its three principal forms, imposes upon the Husband and Wife. The duties of the husband are, in all cases, Love, Fidelity, and Care of his family.

Love is the natural and Divine sanction of the marriage bond. With it marriage is a heaven on earth, without it a hell. Without it, whether antecedent or consequent on marriage, this Divine institution becomes a legalised prostitution. (From the point of view of pure reason, where mutual love exists, to interfere to prevent or break off the union is an unnatural and immoral act. "Those whom God has joined",—by the natural and Divine emotion of Love,—“let no man put asunder.” Loveless marriage can,

at best, be tolerated, lest worse evil follow. Bodily separation where the hearts are united, and marriage without love are equally false and lying acts, wrong and evil in every sense of the word. However Society cannot be expected to read the heart, and so must guide itself by external expression, and when the two once consent to marriage, Society must presume that their contract is the result of love, or will produce, in due course, the love that is the sole bond of natural marriage. The Catholic form of Christianity virtually acknowledges this, by asserting that the ministers of the Divinely instituted Sacrament of Matrimony are the parties themselves. The priest is only the Church's witness, and the mouthpiece of her blessing on the union. That the union is so often an unholy one is the effect of the lying oath with which the contracting parties perjure their souls in the presence, as they believe, of their God.

In most marriages of Europe, and in India, the choice of partners is not given to the contracting parties, the marriage being arranged by the parents. This at first sight, in the light of what has been said above is wholly indefensible and wrong, but as was also mentioned before, Love generally follows. Those men, who miss the happiness of Love in such pre-arranged unions, will find that loving looks, kindly words, and gentle acts produce a rush of Love from the wife, and that in turn will evoke real love in the Husband's heart. Kindness stimulates love, and love begets love infallibly. The initiative is the masculine part.

This duty of love is the same in all forms of marriage, even under the conditions of Polygamy. If a mother can love many children, probably a husband could really love many wives, each with a distinctive regard corresponding to the special character of each. Women will not readily admit this as possible. They are naturally afraid of anything that might threaten the permanence of the marriage bond. Motherhood demands permanence. A woman, moreover, cannot seek relief elsewhere if neglected. Even divorce would not assure her of another marriage. These truths produce a conviction that finds expression in strong feelings of instinctive jealousy. Such Jealousy is natural, and hence, in so far, condemns polygamy. Owing to this jealousy, also, the polygamic family is a less united, loving, and happy institution than the family restricted to one wife. Of course there are exceptions to both sides.

In the Joint Family, the husband's love for his wife is no way different to the love previously described.

The second duty of the husband is Fidelity. Without it love on the part of the wife is in danger of being extinguished. Religious principles and a high sense of duty may prolong its existence in the heart of a really good woman. It would also appear that when a woman has really and fully known what love is, she cannot cease to love. But a good woman's love is too precious a thing to risk losing. Another reason for this virtue on the husband's part

is that a woman, who needs her husband, should, naturally, not be deprived of her rights, on account of an outsider. Again, the husband's infidelity may be the means of introducing the vilest diseases into the family. Under the conditions of polygamy, Fidelity takes the form of justice and due regard to the claims of each wife.

The flower that springs from this root is the happiness of intimate union, its fruit is Mutual Confidence. The joy of friendship is untold, and the most intimate friendship should be that of husband and wife. The conviction that the interests of both are identical is another basis for this friendship.

The preceding remarks regarding the *rights* and *claims* of the wife may sound strange to Indian ears, but in all human affairs there is no contract without mutual give-and-take. Centuries of prescription cannot destroy a claim that is based on the divinely constituted nature of each human being.

The husband's last duty is that he cherish, protect and provide for the wife of his bosom. This too is based on the natural needs of the woman who for such long periods is prevented from undertaking much work before and after Motherhood.

It is on account of thus being the bread-winner that the husband is the natural head of the family. In the Joint Family this position of headship is limited to and exercised over the wife. The demands of brotherly union require submission to the head of the whole family group. The chief obstacle that arises

here comes from the jealousy of the wife of some minor member, sowing doubts and suspicions that tend to create constant bickerings, and even open quarrels that may at last break up the strong bond of brotherhood that so powerfully combats the outside world in the common interest of the joint family. The husband's duty here is by all means in his power to restrain the petulance of his wife, instructing and guiding her aright. With better education, here women might better understand the advantages of the system under which they live. With less liberty they have greater comforts, and a more assured future for their children.

The duties of a wife are correlative to those of a husband, and are similarly, love, fidelity, and obedience.

Fidelity in her is far more important than in the husband. His infidelity endangers the family : hers kills it.

Obedience follows from the fact that every human society, however small, is an organic whole. Because naturally the bread-winner, the husband is the divinely appointed head of the family. Where mutual love exists this is neither asserted, nor called in question. It is taken for granted as a matter of course. In practical life, it secures for the wife, the assured position of respect and honour as his second. If he be king, she is queen and councillor in one. Though the mother be busied primarily with home duties and childward care, and so no fit judge, by herself, of the ways of the world, and the conduct of business transactions,

yet her devotion to her husband and children will often enable her to give more valuable advice than he will easily meet with elsewhere. She should therefore never hesitate to tell her husband, through a false modesty, what she thinks ; nor on the other hand, reproach him with not heeding her advice.

Last but not least, with respect to the use of marriage both husband and wife should be absolutely frank and free towards one another. This cannot be one-sided. Mock modesty will drive the husband to another woman, whose attitude will not tacitly accuse him of being the baser animal of the two. Similarly, any false, quasi-religious scrupulosity on the husband's part tending to misrepresent the Divinely appointed means to parenthood as a deed of darkness and of shame is inevitably destructive of all wifely love and trust. It is based on a lie that the woman's whole being resents as an insult to her place in the world as wife and mother, co-operating with God in His sublimest work on earth.

Divorce is the separation of husband and wife, with the right to form other ties. Religions that look to the individual's benefit as the chief concern, allow of Divorce. Religions that hold that the individual's perfection and self-development are best attained in a stable society, deny that Divorce is ever right. The former class appeal to the fact that Love alone is the natural bond of marriage. The latter maintain that the integrity of the family, for the sake of the children, demands the stability of marriage at all costs, even if it be required to sacrifice the individual for the good

of the community. Hence Catholics and Hindus refuse to sanction it under any circumstances. Protestants and Mohamedans allow it. The ease with which in America marriages are made and un-made is an object-lesson to the world. It is ruining all public morality and society of the old type. God knows what is coming.

It seems natural in this as in all else, to say that no hard and fast rule can decide the question. Where greater evils flow from the continuance of the marriage, divorce justifies itself. It is a dangerous abnormal remedy for an unnatural evil. At all costs the children must be provided for: that safe-guarded, the end of marriage stands.

To summarize, the family is a naturally developed social institution on which, as all men believe, the welfare of the race depends. The marriage relation is entered into in obedience to the sexual instinct. The long period of helplessness of the child, however necessitates the permanence of the marriage tie. The first result of the sex desires is the birth of love, the strongest of all altruistic emotions. Polygamy, however, is not unnatural as not incompatible with love, and also as the care of the child can be secured by it. Polyandry is unnatural and only temporarily justifiable. The Indian Joint Family system has the advantage of economy.

Racial suicide is unnatural, and a national calamity. It indicates a defective political economy that has led to too great inequality in the distribution of the nation's

wealth. It is immoral in the individual, as inspired by a desire to escape from the hard tasks of child-bearing and rearing.

The husband's first duty is Love, either antecedent or consequent on marriage. It is the only natural bond of marriage. In pre-arranged unions it usually follows. It can exist even with Polygamy. Fidelity is the husband's second duty. It flows from Love. To cherish his wife is the third. These are also the rights of the wife. Her correlative duties are Love, Fidelity, and Obedience.

They both owe each other the mutual respect that springs from a frank and true realising of the dignity of the marriage act. The use of marriage is a good deed for three reasons, 1st and foremost, to have children ; 2nd to foster mutual love and 3rd as a means to avoid fornication.

Finally, divorce is a dangerous remedy for extreme ills of married life.

CHAPTER V.

THE CHILD.

The Father is the natural head of the family. The Mother rules by his side as Queen. The child is the subject in this kingdom of love. Here is the type of all Divinely constituted, or naturally right and lawful authority. Here, too, is the type of all self-respecting obedience, fidelity and loyalty. The spirit of Authority must be love ; the end must be the welfare of the governed ; the means, absolute self-sacrifice at the

dictates of loving wisdom meeting a loving and prompt submission and obedience. The presence of this mutually complimentary duty that results in peace and order in the family calls for special consideration, as this will supply principles for practical duties where-soever authority asserts herself and loyalty is called forth.

Here are the duties of parent and child. From the father, careful provision, protection, advice, and an education and training in all the best he knows. From the Mother, bodily cherishing, comfort and love, that either welcomes death, in an ecstasy of self-sacrifice for the child, or, as promptly, submits to years of patient toil for its good. There is no hope of reward for all this devotion. It is the cry of the parent's heart, the imperious instinct of parental nature, the mighty voice of God.

The welfare of the human race to be demands this. Human beings, as Burke says somewhere, are not a race of summer flies whose second generation comes forth only after its predecessor is already extinct. The future needs years,—long years,—of watchful attention during the helplessness of childhood, and of loving advice and prudent guidance through the impetuous time of youth. Naturally, the child is *not* for the parents, but the parents for the child. However, as in all human bonds, the duties are mutual. Love calls forth gratitude: gratitude confirms love. The cherished babe becomes the solace of the parent's declining years. However, even though the father and

mother knew that they would be left untended and uncared for by the child they nourished, this would not take from their love and loving care. A horrible record tells of South American savages that devoured their aged parents. It does not tell of parents that devoured their children. That deeper, because more unnatural horror had its home in the east as the result of superstition. Infanticide has not as yet disappeared from the land of the Sons of Kings. False honour leads these chivalrous Rajputs to a crime that all the tortures of all the hells could not compel him to perpetrate.

And what is the duty of the Child? The duty of the debtor to his creditor. All he has his parents gave him at the cost of a life-time of toil and suffering. His life alone he owes to Nature, to God direct. His conception may have been a pleasure. It is overpaid a thousand fold by the Mother's agonies at his birth. Unnatural children have said, that they never asked to be born, as an attempted excuse for undutifulness. But they have asked in a million ways, from the first gasping cry at birth, that they might be permitted to live. The unremitting toil and self-sacrifice of both parents through all the years of his need has answered the child's supplication. But for them he had died, had not been let live.

In addition to the prolongation of his life, education, shelter, food and clothing were all lovingly bestowed. The heart of the child should respond with an outflow of love and gratitude and should manifest

itself in obedience in childhood, and in youth; and in later life, in gentle care of the parent's failing years.

This is the highest glory and the chief lesson of the Eastern home. This natural, God-commanded virtue of loving submission to parental authority makes home heaven. It is in the East alone that it can be said, "Children are the poor man's Savings Bank." The world needs to come East to re-learn this sacred lesson that it has all but forgot; to learn it at the feet of Indian mothers from the example of Indian sons.

Reverence as to God, obedience, and love, these are the duties of the child to his parents, natural, and, therefore, for evermore, Divine, God-commanded in every beat of the human heart that brutal self-seeking has not hardened. Another of the influences at work on the plastic mind of the little child is the intimate action of brothers and sisters on each other. It may be well to recapitulate. We have seen that the first altruistic, or other-regarding instinct was that of sex. Now, as in primitive times, from it man learns unselfishness. He will die for the woman he loves. As a second stage, we have the birth of the helpless babe. The long protracted helplessness of infancy and childhood necessarily demands the permanence of the bond of love between husband and wife. The common, instinctive love of both father and mother is God's answer, in nature, to the infant's feeble cry. The stable family is thus a need of the man and woman as well as the child. It is required if they are to develop

the best that is in them. Many of the duties that the family entails have already been examined in the preceding considerations. It now remains to remark on two other relationships that it calls forth. The first of these is the mutual bond between children of the same family. (p. 213).

The dear love of brothers and sisters is a sacred bond indeed, God-produced in the nature of things, *viz.*, it is the result of the long period of childhood, during which the young ones of the family grow up together. The sweetness and full influence for good of this home relationship is perhaps hardly to be realized outside that primitive unit of society, the monogamic family. There alone is to be found the ideal that other forms of marriage must vainly strive after.

Polygamy knows of it only as a dream and a fairy tale. The jealousies of the harem are reproduced in the jealousies of the brothers. Indeed a tradition of conflict replaces brotherly love in Moslem India. It was and is there looked upon as a commonplace among the sons of the wealthy and great. How else, they ask, is it possible to decide who is the most capable heir of the dying prince or lord. This inhuman 'struggle for existence' spreads its contagion even into the monogamic family of the Moslem. History with woful iteration, repeats the indecency of Moslem princes in fratricidal conflict. Often, in self-defence, the murderous process was begun even before the breath of life had left the body of the unfortunate father, and he had, but too often to live to see the violent reversal of the

partialities of his heart. The records of the palmiest days of the Mogul Empire supply us with the most striking instances of this disorder.

Sweet sister-love, the purest, most ennobling and unselfish of the charities of home, poor purblind India knows thee not. As brotherly love is the bond of home, uniting the family within itself as against outsiders, so a sister is meant to be the gentle tie that links one family to another. How horribly her gracious function in society has been perverted in India will hardly bear telling in plain words. And the root of all this evil is the accursed hypocrisy of artificial horror that surrounds the sacred act of sexual intercourse. A mother is the holiest thing alive, but the man that makes a mother of her is insulting, degrading, contaminating her with a foulness that is conceived of as communicated to all her relatives. As a result the daughter is sent away as soon as possible to be brought up and engrafted into the family of her husband. The Moslem has adopted the prurient falsehood from his Hindu neighbour. That a sister, or daughter is the wife of another man is looked upon as a stigma of the family that allows its women to be in such sort entreated as shall make mothers of them. The stupidity of it would be laughable were its consequences not so lamentable. The up-rooting and transplanting of the tender child-wife is an unnatural refinement of cruelty that brings its own punishment with it. Mohamedan polygamy and its disunited family shake the foundations of society by sapping the holy bond of brotherhood, as we shall see presently, and

the Hindu system does the same, by rejecting the sister from the home which she best blesses and beautifies. India does not know the meaning of union. The family alone can teach that lesson, and the Indian family knows it not by its very constitution. All Indian cohesion is due to external pressure. They unite only against a common foe, and even that with mutual distrust.

But to return to the matter in hand, the lesson that family life was intended, or rather, does naturally, convey is the spirit of benevolent, unselfish, protecting love, for one another, the spirit of solidarity, of working for a common cause, and of recognising and co-operating in a friendly way with similarly united groups, or families. Benevolence, Co-operation, *esprit-de-corps*, on the one hand, and neighbourliness on the other thus constitute what may be termed, technically as by F. D. Maurice, the ethos of Consanguinity.

The history of Law shows that it has always recognised the unity of the family. It has legalised paternal authority. It has safe-guarded the marriage contract. It in times gone-by, even treated the whole family as responsible for the actions of its members. And this was but natural and right. All Society known of and studied, whether internally in the manners and customs which constitute its daily life, or in the laws of the state that coerce, discipline, and control it externally, will be found to be an evolution of that correlative authority and obedience proceeding from the natural bond of father and child, and of the spirit of mutual trust and love that is born of the sweet relation of

brothers and sisters. The seed of all society is the Family. From the Family, the House, or Gens, or Clan, or Gotra; and from the clan the Tribe; and lastly, from the tribe the Nation. Without united families, united internally and externally, the Nation is an empty dream. So much is this a recognised and admitted truth that, in cases where this natural and normal development has been interfered with by conquest, a fiction of adoption was resorted to, says Sir Henry Maine, by the law-givers of old to reconcile it with the process that was natural, and accepted as such by all laws and customs.

And this matter stands out as of the highest importance amid all ethical considerations. If the law-givers of the past based Society on the material fact of internally united families also externally united to one another, the virtues that the family evokes and sustains, the new spirit of Love that there takes its birth has been by all seers and prophets of to-day, looked upon as the spirit of life and regeneration that shall renew the face of the earth. "Our Father who art in Heaven," prayed the founder of Christianity. "Little children love one another," said the disciple most imbued with his spirit. Tolstoy, heart-sick at the corruptions of the world around him knows no other cure. The spirit of universal brotherly love is alone expected to restore the world, or raise the world, to the glorious moral heights of which humanity is capable. This is the highest lesson of the second part of this sketch of natural religion. Love your neighbour as

yourself. Fraternity alone makes Liberty and Equality possible. By it when realized, does the reason of Man hope to sublime duty into a 'joy for ever,'—a love-inspired ecstasy of mutually beneficial activity. *Faxit Deus.*

CHAPTER VI.

THE PUPIL.

But in the splendours of the dream we must not allow ourselves to lose sight of the simple homely fact that the natural source of these virtues is the home, and alas, the home is dying fast, all the world over. Indeed for the major part of the educated classes it is already dead. I fear it is fast dying even among the lower middle class, and among the very poor, the over-worked factory hands as well.

And in place of the home we have the lodging-house for the parents, and the Boarding School for the children. For the greater part of their developing lives they grow up under what one is tempted to call and speak of as "artificial" conditions. This, would, however, not be quite exact. The evolution of the human race, the progress of civilisation, the complex differentiation of modern Society, is the result of a natural process, and as such is as Divinely intended as the more primitive organization of self-sufficient families. That the system at present spreading so extensively all over the world brings with it a training more varied, harsher, and less beautified by the gentler graces of life is clear to the most careless observer. That the edu-

cation do not end in a return to the days of savage isolation and selfishness, when each fought out the struggle for life with the callous disregard of the brute for the lot of others, this is the evil that it would seem, the human race of individuals must consciously and confidently oppose relying on the beneficent working of the good God in the natural processes of human evolution. To meet young men, hardly more than boys, already keen students, and even proficient in all the laws of commercial competition and possessing thorough practical acquaintance with the best means fitted to enable them to get the better of their neighbour in every transaction, is a startling and disturbing sign of the times that is well calculated to be profoundly disquieting and depressing to all save the philosopher who has learnt, as I have said to see the hand of God in all nature. Indeed, at first sight, it would seem to point to a return to that disunited homogeneity, which Spencer has shewn to be the characteristic of the days of inchoate organizations.

However the trend of the past may indicate the path of the future generations. The era of the patriarchal family with its slaves was followed by the feudal system with its serfs and villains,—in India too, under other names,—and that by the supremacy of trade and manufacture, with its starving proletariat. Now, each of these had its distinctive educational methods suited to the demands of the times, but, in all, the moral lessons taught were but amplifications of the home virtues. In all three the moral worth of union

and solidarity,—brotherhood,—was insisted on as the sole means by which the highest perfection of the individual, as of the body politic, was to be assured. Also in all three, the education of the home and in the home was never wholly discontinued.

Now, what is the outlook for the future? The family tribe became the principality, and the principality the nation. Is the national ideal to be replaced by the race-empire? Modern facilities of intercommunication now make the idea a possibility to an extent that the ephemeral empires based on conquest could not have hoped for in their wildest dreams and most extravagant imaginings. I am not here concerned with the particular form of government that may eventually be adopted. Such an empire appears equally compatible with all forms of rule, democracy, oligarchy, or autocracy. The point here to be emphasised is that the family is no longer to be the sole, nor even the principal academy for the virtues, or moral habitudes that are to fit they young for the part they are to play in the new world. Indeed, the influence of home is fast becoming a negligible quantity even in our own day. And all these considerations tend to prove that the functions of the school and the position of the school-master are ever more and more becoming of grave importance for the public weal.

The relation of tutor and pupil is thus important enough to demand treatment in a separate chapter.

CHAPTER VI.

I wish I could bring it within the scope of this

work to reproduce the thoughtful and wise papers on ideal education by Mr. Percy Wynn, in the pages of East and West. It will be in the school that the young will have to learn the old fundamental truths of morality, of the supreme need of Benevolence, of Brotherly, or Neighbourly Love, of Co-operation and Mutual Trust, of *esprit-de-crois* along with the yet more fundamental duties of loyalty and obedience to rightly constituted authority. Now more than ever are these lessons needed when the commercial spirit of the world has such enormous rewards to give to shrewd craft and the exploiting of others for the aggrandizement of self. Hitherto Boarding Schools have turned out very efficient men of the world indeed, but not only with the efficiency but also often with the calculating ruthlessness of a Frankenstein. Indeed Boarding and Public Schools of to-day are sometimes hot-beds for prematurely forcing ripe the most unrestrained self-indulgence, callous indifference to others and refined cruelty. "They used to boast of forming men of character: this is the last thing that they do to-day." Morals and the graces of life are inseparable from the charities of home, as the world is now constituted.

This cannot continue, though unfortunately it may become much worse before it mend. A higher type of school-master, and perhaps, the system of mixed schools is what the future has in store. India is, at present, far indeed from Europe and America as regards these matters, but the European system of Boarding-houses attached to schools has been intro-

duced into the country by her English rulers, and it is a system that has come to stay, so that here too the crying need of the present is a better school-master. A higher salary to secure a better type of man is not the principal means to this end. What is wanted is a more insistent interference of parents in the selection of those to whom they are to delegate their parental duties. Control of the selection and not control of the man selected is needed. If he is worthy to be chosen he is worthy to be trusted. The tutor should be a god in the estimation of his pupils. Parents should take care that he be deserving of the worshipful position he is intended to fill. Apathy in this matter, and a demand that Government should do the needful is a criminal neglect of a most clear definite duty. Government action in regard to schools should be limited to inspection, so as to insist on a fitting standard of training being maintained. Private schools, and not Government schools are what is wanted.

The teacher and trainer of the young should be a perfect man. Academical qualifications are of no account in comparison with character in the composition of the ideal School-master.

He stands, as the old school of thought phrased it, *in loco parentis*, and his duties are those of a father. His pupils owe him therefore the same duties that they owe to their parents. To their comrades they stand in the relation that they held towards their brothers and sisters.

The school is a necessity of modern times. In the midst of the urgent demands of modern civilisation, the father has not the time, and often not the qualifications best adapted to call forth, or educe, the particular traits of character or ability that suit the needs of his son. Hence he delegates this task of Education to a teacher, or *guru*. With the duty he also necessarily delegates his authority to the master selected. Hence the duties of a teacher are those of a father, and the duties of the pupil are the corresponding filial duties of docility and obedience. Although these are restricted to the acquirement of knowledge and of the habits of right conduct they are of no less obligation and importance on that account. They are rather emphasised by that consideration. The future well-being of the pupil depends on the fidelity with which he fulfils his obligations during this period of training.

Hinduism lays great stress on its institution of Brahmacharya, on the importance of self-restraint at this time of life, especially in matters of sex. This is profoundly right and natural. The boy is not a man. Besides, the concentration of mind on the duties of pupillage has its fruit in the perfectly developed manhood so attained. It assures a long and happy life of maturity.

It is almost impossible to exaggerate the importance of this point, if we once realize the tremendous power of the habits acquired in youth. The tree grows as the sapling is bent.

Again we have said that the school does more. It replaces the home right through, in the new order of the world, at any rate for the Boarder. It takes the place of the home in the development of the young. Right conduct for the pupil consists in recognizing his own incompleteness and immaturity, and the consequent need he has of the assistance of his tutor. This implies the virtues of Docility and Reverence for his rightly appointed guide and friend. He is too young to chose for himself, and must accept the selection made by his parents.

To his companies he should manifest a true spirit of Comradeship and cheerful Kindliness. The school, far more so than the home, is a little world. The pupils are there to rehearse the parts they are to play in the great and divine drama of life, with this difference, that in the school there should be every precaution that, as much as possible, the corruptions of the world shall be excluded. It is the duty of the tutor to take care to keep his school full of clean, sweet, healthy youth. The over-ripe or rotten fruit must be picked out and removed at all costs lest it contaminate the whole basketful.

Another and an invaluable result of school-life is the training of the young mind to Work. Work is the lot of Man on earth, a blessing or a curse accordingly as it is manfully accepted or pusillanimously shirked. It matters little from this point of view what is taught in schools. It matters very much indeed, how it is taught. Let it not be forgotten. Work is a natural

necessity of human life. It is therefore Divinely appointed, and like all that is divine, it is the source of countless benefits. To work with patience, to combat difficulties with perseverance, to face the pain of effort and the irksome routine of monotonous work is an invaluable preparation for the duties of public life. It brings with it the reward of the joy of victory, the wise consciousness of personal limitations, and the spirit of determination to make the most of one's self. What this means in character for mation must be clear to all.

Thus is the pupil trained for the world. He becomes a more useful if a less amiable creature than the carefully fostered and lovingly cherished child brought up under the eyes of his parents, and moulded by intercourse with brothers and sisters alone. The child is father of the man, and the school trained man is quite a different product to the home bred youth. The difference is fundamental. It is, however, the function of the prophet and not of the humble author of these pages to foretell the nature of the new world that shall arise when all the men and women shall be the produce of the cultivated field and not of virgin soil. The present writer, thank God, will have long been dead. The better world of the future will not be the world that I know and love. It will not be my world.

CHAPTER VII.

MY NEIGHBOUR AND MYSELF.

It has been noted, as a sort of self-evident conception, that the Family developed into the Nation. The

earlier stages are said to be clearly traceable in the records we have of primitive times. Indeed, the transitional stages can all be met with here in India. Contemporary India even yet repays the student of sociology who searches among her many peoples for relics of primitive society. Of course this search must be carried on in the wilder parts of this continent. The state of India to-day has, not inaptly, been compared to the starry heavens, and the wonders that they reveal overhead. One glance above presents us, as existing side by side in the same glorious panorama, the appearance of stars as they were at periods of time far apart from one another, accordingly as the rays of light from different distances take different times to reach the eyes of the beholder. So, in the mental vision India unrolls before the eye of the student, the Stone Age will be found contemporary with Radium and Aviation, Marriage by capture by the side of Marriages of selection and mutual consent. It is, therefore, possible here, in a way, to verify the theories of the western Sociologist by actual observation. One of these theories is the evolution of the Nation from the expanded Family.

Now the growth of the tribe from the clan, and of the clan from the family, so far is clearly traceable, but the modern idea of the nation is found to involve a new conception that reaches beyond, though implicit in the family, in the mutual relation of Brotherhood. *The Nation as such is not a collection of families, but a collection of individuals.* The distinction is modern,

and it is fundamental. How far India is prepared to accept it is another question. In certain parts of the country even the older idea of a nation of amalgamated families or tribes is hardly accepted. That the individual should be regarded as a unit, independent, the same as any other unit, responsible in his own person, and with no reference to his origin or birth, this indeed is new wine for the old bottles of the East. As whole-heartedly and unreservedly accepted, I doubt whether it exists outside of the United States of America. Where birth and its privileges still exist, they are a remnant of the old idea. Still the newer phrase expresses a conclusion drawn from the older conception of nationality. It is the natural outgrowth of the former, as soon as the pressure of numbers begins to be felt. It is innate in every American because every American is the child of emigration, of that violent uprooting which is the ultimate result of over-pressure of numbers. No wonder it is self-evident to him. Growing India is, perhaps, soon destined to accept the definition too, but not I fear, without all the throes of a revolution in soul and heart, if not in the world of public life.

Maine speaks as though this revolutionary idea were entirely accepted in Europe. Perhaps, in a sense, and as a theory, after the French Revolution, it has been widely adopted. Practically, as said above, it is to be found in America alone. But the simple sounding definition has been subscribed to by many an orthodox Conservative and true blue Tory, without his in the least realizing all its consequences. Here is

the form in which it is put by F. D. Maurice, "A Nation is a collection of individuals, *i.e.*, of selves brought together into one place; contiguity and individual personality; my Neighbour and Myself."

The genesis of the Nation seems to have taken place as follows. As soon as crowding clans bring with them clashing claims to privileges and exceptions on the score of birth there arises a state of tension, which results in the break up of the older forms of cohesion, and the resolution of the solid mass into a more fluid condition of the constituents molecules. Personalities, as such, are, by nature equal, as we have seen before. Their stable union as a nation arises from the conflicting demands of each and every self that it shall be respected as of indefeasible right. Such is the ideal, aim or sense, conscious or not, that constitutes the bond between the equal selves or units. Its concrete expression is termed Law. A common Language makes the Law a possibility. Language is the means.

Thus far the objective aspect of the matter. To it corresponds the virtue of Justice. Trite, and savouring of copy-book morality of a particularly old-fashioned type though it be, we have the synopsis of all Law, and the essence of all Justice in the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you." Commonplace as it may be, it stands as a fact that this does express the mutual relation of the individuals of a Nation. It phrases the Self-respect and the Regard for others without which any Society

is impossible. ~~It~~ alone makes property possible. It is its only safeguard. Acted up to the full extent, it should make excessive accumulation of property an impossibility. Such is the dream of the Socialist.

"Love thy neighbour as thyself", is the form that this maxim takes in the teachings of Christ. I would here draw attention to the moderation of the language. There is no natural or Divine injunction to love my neighbour more than myself, in the bond of Nationality that links me to him.

Truth-telling and Honesty are merely aspects of Justice, and consequent on the nature of the dealings men have with one another in the Societies they have formed for their mutual advantage, and of which the Nation is the widest and most effective. Without these three, Justice, Honesty and Truth, the unity and permanence of a Nation will be found to be purely artificial and certain to break up before the very first internal strain or external shock. Sensitiveness to these points constitutes the Honour of individuals as of Nations. When endangered it has always been considered a justifiable *casus belli*.

We have seen that the individual is expected, of right and obligation, to deny himself for the good of the family, and here, too, the individual is similarly bound in duty to forget himself for the good of the larger organization of which he is also a part. This is a very far-reaching consideration, and deserving of special examination.

And first, as regards self-denial, or self-sacrifice, as

a moral necessity, is this not a self-contradictory statement ? Hitherto, the self-realization of the individual, his perfecting himself to the full limits of his nature, has been regarded as the standard of right. How does this stand if now we urge that the claims of morality may demand the surrender of the life of the self ? This would not be Self-realization, but self-destruction. The demands of Humanity, and of the future, the good that they are to derive from the individual's extinction may be an indication that such is the need of the trend of natural evolution, the general aim of the Divine Author of nature, but how is this to be reconciled with what has previously been laid down ? The explanation is two-fold. First, an adequate reason for the morality of Self-sacrifice to the death can only be found in a direct relation to the Author of the self bringing with it the perfection of Self-realization. It follows that Self-realization is a matter independent of death. It supposes that the Self subsists after death, and when Time shall be no more. And this may be in one of two ways. Either the Self continues to live after what is inaccurately described as Death, or because human life is felt or believed to be but a transient state of the Eternal Self that must perfect and realise Itself in the relations of Society even more abundantly and rapidly than in the more restricted area of the home, and therefore, a fortiori, more than as an isolated unit. The higher moral value of the Society is, in any case, a fact of experience. Here, really, is the best, or highest, school for

character-building. Common manners and customs, and a common tongue by which we readily understand one another, help on this work by the greater opportunities they give for the interaction of mind on mind, of character on character. The result of this mutual intercourse is the National Character, national aspirations, national ideals, and their embodiment in national institutions

In proportion as this national civilisation is valued as of importance to further the moral growth of Man it supplies the only justification for war, but one fully adequate. The Spartan mother or wife could send her son or her husband to battle, and fasten the shield on his arm with the words "with the shield, or on it," only because she felt that the only alternative worthy of a man were death or honour as defined above. It meant that there are ideas and ideals, customs and institutions, which it is necessary to fight for to the death; that one should be glad to die for. Hence is the soldier worthy of honour; and rightly is the national martyr glorified as a hero.

The second explanation of the morality of Self-sacrifice is but another form of stating the first, but of value for its fruitful suggestions. It is also historically interesting, but this aspect of the matter is outside the scope of this work. The ultimate form of Self-sacrifice, by which one is "obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross," implies that there are degrees in this self-denial. Now that thought leads us naturally to the fundamental distinction between higher and lower selves. It has been found as a fact of experience

that, owing to the hard and fast limitations of the material world, in efforts to secure the perfection of the bodily self, the strong, healthy, well-fed, well clothed, well-lodged body, we necessarily come into frequent and uncompromisable conflict with other selves. Where there is only enough food for one when two are present, one must starve and die. To half it may mean the death of both. In such a case, individual morality, according to the laws of nature, allows the stronger to take it for himself, The weaker must die. National Morality demands that the private shall surrender his life for the sake of the officer, as his is the life the more precious of the two for the common weal. The poet dreams of a humanitarian Morality, so that either leaves it to the other, and the two die with loving arms entwined around each other, and the untouched loaf between them. In any case, here is the source of the most violent and constant of disputes, the needs of the body.

On the other hand, moral and intellectual habitudes of the self are a decided and a permanent gain to others. This therefore implies a wider sphere for personal activities, an entrance into fuller and wider relations with others, and thus a greater and more rapid development of the self. The fuller Man arises easiest in this field of the spirit,—in this field that the spirit constitutes, maintains, and perfects. This is the sphere of the higher self. The poet's dream embraces a world-wide interchange of Self-perfecting intercourse. The facts of the world to-day give only the restricted

area of the nation. Hence, a Man's duties to his country are the practical matter that now remains to be considered.

Before doing this, it seems fit to mention here, by the way, that spheres for world-wide activity are, even in our day, well within the reach of most educated citizens of the various nations of the world. In the material world, commerce; in the intellectual world, science, in the fullest sense of the word: and in the moral world, art and religion, furnish opportunities for the widest of relations for the fullest measures of Self-realization.

But yet on the whole we may say, that as matters stand, nations are the means for the attainment of moral perfection in the fullest way. One who serves his nation perfects his nature better than another who benefits his family or himself, provided the intensity of his activities be the same. The question of this intensity belongs to the third part. To return to the matter in hand, to value the means of self-realization placed at one's disposal by his own nation is undoubtedly praiseworthy. This is the virtue of Patriotism. It is folly to despise the systems of other nations. It is wisdom to see the beauty of the whole great world, where all and each work to the same end, the perfection of the human race, in different degrees and in varied ways, and to watch how the forms that are harmful, or too slow, are gradually making room for wiser methods of maintaining and perfecting the national ideal.

The practical question of the duties of a citizen are now clear from the preceding considerations. Law implies fidelity to the Law, or Loyalty, and Public Spirit. These, properly speaking are not the lessons learnt at home, whatever copy-book morality may say to the contrary. At home the authority is essentially autocratic. Obedience is necessarily child-like and unquestioning. There the rule is, *stat pro ratione voluntas*. It continues, as already pointed out in the patriarchal form of rule. India has not outgrown this view of things, or this stage of evolution as yet, nor is she likely to do so, as regards the greater number of her children for a long while to come. European democratic ideas are a powerful ferment, however, and perhaps, the leavening will after all, take effect sooner than most imagine, or anticipate.

The transition from home methods to public life is supplied by schools. Schools and schoolmasters introduce us to stable laws, whose *raison d'être* is not the welfare of the individual but of the community of individuals. Here the aim is to provide greater opportunities for the many, and not unique advantages for the one. But here, too, the mouth-piece of the Law speaks as one having authority independent of the subject. The good of the individual is not entirely lost sight of in the thought of the many. Even in punishment, the schoolmaster, like the parent, can truly say with Ichabod Crane, "You will thank me for this the longest day of your life." At any rate so he fondly hopes.

In the wider community of the Nation, the differences between School and Home are all strongly emphasised. In the Nation, the stability of the Laws is a fundamental necessity. It is the sole guarantee of order and peace, the condition of all progress, individual and national. The concrete means of realizing this stability is called Government. It is also the source of Law, and its protection as well.

As a consequence, Loyalty to Government is the natural, and therefore the right form of expressing Patriotism. Emotions for an abstraction are empty until they take body. It is this or that particular country and nation, as it is, and as a whole, that we should rightly love, with all its social, political, and religious aspects as they are. In India it is the British Government, and the British Royal Family, and the Constitution under them, that are the normal objects of this regard, because it is due to them, for instance, that India is now the eager, hopeful nation that she is renewing her youth like the Phoenix. We may hope that India shall be better and happier in the future. Even then, that future is the child of the present. The present Government demands present Loyalty, as its moral right. It is the best that 2,000 years of Indian history can show. Every true son of India will own this truth, and with pride. Her law-abiding people have made it possible: their love of justice has recognised its justice: their consent and love can alone keep it in being.

From Government flows the sanction of law, viz.,

Reward and Punishment. There is no pretence here of benefitting the punished, or helping him to realise himself. He may even be destroyed, but the higher selves of millions shall not be jeopardized for one. Ultimately, it is to the advantage of all men that the law be vindicated and maintained, as long as it serves the end of its existence. When the law is outworn, a Nation that possesses the inestimable boon of a good Government, or Constitution, has its automatic methods of replacing the old and effete by the new and living. The importance of attaining to this smooth working of the machinery of Government is incalculable. Where this gets out of order it is like the snapping of a live power-wire, and carries widespread dismay, death and destruction among all those whom it was, till broken, serving and benefitting so largely. Hear what Tennyson says, speaking of these constitutional modifications of Government.

Meet is it changes should control
Our being, lest we rust in ease.

We all are changed by still degrees,
All but the basis of the soul.

So let the change which comes be free
To ingroove itself with that which flies,
And work, a joint of State, that plies
Its office, moved by Sympathy.

But mark the warning that follows—

A saying hard to shape in act ;
For all the past of Time reveals

A bridal dawn of thunder-peals
Wherever Thought hath wedded Fact.

Such is the testimony of History. A departure from the regular processes of State is always in danger of becoming a Revolution, after the fashion of the Archetype of all such violent changes, the French Revolution. It is both commenced and carried on with bloodshed, anarchy and chaos, and so delays its own aims. The autocracy of Napoleon had to precede the birth of the French Republic, and even then not till long other years of blood had been passed through by the suffering country. The welfare of a million individuals is as nothing in the battle-field of ideas. The End must be a precious one indeed beyond all count if it is to be held sufficiently dear to justify such means.

This precious End is in some form or other, a closer Union among men. Sometimes it is nothing more than the closer Union brought about by the pressure of external conquest. Indeed there is no other way to break through the self-centred and self-satisfied isolation of certain semi-civilised peoples. This thought is worth emphasising. Union was thus seen to be a necessity in the Family, in the love of husband and wife, in the filial and paternal relations of obedience and authority between parent and child. Union is required for the Comradeship and Discipline acquired in the School. Union is expressed in the Nation by Loyalty and Patriotism. Now it would seem that the trend of modern ideals is that Union is as needed for

the whole of Humanity as it is for the smaller aggregates of men, the Home and School and State.

The demand for this Union is also seen in the fact that the intercourse between different nations by Commerce alone is become more intimate. The dislocation of Trade that affects even the non-combatant nations so profoundly whenever a war breaks out among the more belligerently inclined sometimes makes it imperative for all the other nations of the world to interfere and compel a cessation of hostilities. Arbitration Courts are a practical recognition of this, and though not yet in satisfactory working order, are a hopeful sign of the times. Much more remains to be done before we come to the time.

“When the war-drum throbs no longer, and the
battle-flags are furled,

“In the Parliament of Man, and the Federation
of the world.

“There the common sense of most shall hold a
fretful realm in awe,

“And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in uni-
versal law.”

So the Poet dreams, but the dreamer of to-day is termed a seer to-morrow, and the poet is honoured as a prophet by the sons of those to whom he said in bitterness of heart; “We have piped unto you, and you have not danced; we have mourned unto you and you have not lamented.” The consolation comes later on. “Wisdom is justified of her children.” The

Reformer is the intermediary between the dreamer and the National Hero. In the nation and its social institutions we have a set of ideals realised. When these are outworn arises the Reformer to point the way to the fuller realization of the self, that his clearer mind can see. Precisely in proportion to his clearer vision his "reforms" are for him a necessity. They are a demand of his conscience. In this he stands in opposition to those who hold that the manners and customs the laws and institutions of to-day are amply sufficient for the needs of men. And this is true for the majority of men. They find in the environment in which they were born and live all the relations that their moral natures need for self-development to the full of what they conceive such self-development to be. These are the majority, and hence the one who dies to maintain the status quo is a Hero. The Prophet and Reformer, ninety-nine times out of a hundred, must be a martyr before he can secure a hearing. But this must come to him in time. He is in advance of his day. Says Byron, "They never fail who die in a great cause," *i.e.*, in a cause which riper growth will see to be a fuller expression of Man's ideals, individual and social.

Modern Civilisation,—material civilisation,—is, thus, a means to an end, *viz.*, to make the human race more rational, more moral, more brotherly in their actions, in their conduct, and in their Character from which their actions and emotions flow. And National Governments are the safeguards of civilisation, and of

immense value as such, but there is danger of exaggerating its importance. The real worth of all such embodiments of a nation's aspirations depends, in the first place, on the nature of those aspirations and ideals, and not on the particular form they take now or in the future. I quote from Grant Allen's *British Barbarians*. "Why what I mean is just this. Civilisation, after all, is only the ability to live together in great organised communities, (*i.e.*, Nations). It doesn't necessarily imply any higher moral status, or any greater rationality than those of the savage. All it implies is greater cohesion, more unity, higher division of function." According to the late Professor James, it merely proves the power of habit, so that the toiler for the sake of the community slaves at his task almost entirely because he has grown up to the toil, is habituated to it, stays in the groove in which he finds himself. But to continue my quotation ;—"But the functions"—of civilisation—"themselves, may be as irrational and unintelligent as any that exist among the most primitive peoples. Advance in civilisation doesn't necessarily involve either advance in real knowledge of one's relation to the universe, or advance in moral goodness and personal culture. Some highly civilised nations of historic times have been more cruel and barbarous than many quite uncultivated ones. For example, the Romans, at the height of their civilisation, went mad drunk with blood at their gladiatorial shows: the Athenians of the age of Pericles and Socrates, offered up human sacrifices at the Thargelia, like the veriest

savages ; and the Phoenicians and Carthaginians the most civilised commercial people of the world in their time, as the English are now, gave their own children to be burnt alive as victims to Baal, &c." "Advance in real knowledge of one's relations to the universe, or advance in moral goodness and personal culture " these are of vital importance. They are the end to which civilization is the means. How these are to be secured, and in what they consist, is what still further is to be considered. But what it is and how it is to be preserved we shall see in the Third Part.



PART III.

THE BEAUTIFUL—ANANDA.

Chapter I.—God and Man.

Chapter II.—Godwards.

Chapter III.—The Beauty of God.

Chapter IV.—The Love of God.

PART III.**THE BEAUTIFUL.****CHAPTER I.***God and Man.*

As soon as we enter into direct relations with God we step into the world of the Beautiful, the sphere of Love and Joy, even though the first steps there be made with self-reproach and self-condemnation. There is a sweetness even in the tears of repentance. It washes the heart clean, and only the clean of heart see God. This, I trust, will soon be clear.

The end of this part is to arouse the emotion of the Love of God. This is the end of all religion. This, too, is the source of the tremendous influence that religion exercises on the life and conduct of men. Now to produce an emotion in another it is necessary that it be experienced by the speaker, or writer. Otherwise his words ring false. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal", says St. Paul. This fact is to be seen in religious emotions as in all others. It was for this reason that my first thought was to make this part an Anthology of religious poems. Poetry is the natural language of the emotions. It is the beautiful expression of the beautiful. By its very nature it tends to produce those emotions that the poet has first experienced himself, under the influence of beauty. As the Source of all beauty, God should be the subject-matter of

the highest Poesy. Unfortunately, the perception of this Divine Beauty is the possession of the Saints alone. Poets are far from being Saints, are Saints only from a very restricted point of view, and as it were in an inchoate manner.

“Poetry’s the last whispered echo on earth.

“Of the beautiful music of Heaven :

“There the theme is the Splendour of Increate Truth

“And to Seraphs are meet voices given”.

However, of those poets who have treated of the beauty and joy of virtue, and of the service of God, the majority, if not all have treated the subject from the point of view of the teacher, and, with their didactic purpose, the emotional value of their work has been dissipated; or else, they have written at such length as not to allow of their inclusion.

My next thought was to make this part consist of selections from the sacred writings of the principal religions of the world. The principle of selection should be to take note only of such parts as would be universally accepted, and to which parrallel passages could be found in most other Scriptures. Unfortunately, my acquaintance with these is not so great as it should be for this purpose. If some one better suited than I were to make such a collection, he would provide a better conclusion to this work, than any thing that I can hope to do. That such a work is possible is proved even by the limited selections made, from the Holy writ of Jains, Sikhs, Buddhists; Christians, Hindus,

Mohommedans and Parsis, by Motilal M. Munshi of Bombay in his Dictionary of "Useful Instruction". To one who has not attended to it, it is astonishing how much the different religions of the world have in common. This book is an endeavour to select, at least, common principles. And in the highest, or emotional, part of religion, the parallelism will be found in no degree less constant than in the doctrinal portions.

Yet another form that this third part could well take would be that of a sort of universal hagiology,—a collection of the Lives of the Saints, from all parts of the world; of men whose lives would be recognised by the consciences of all as worthy examples of whatever is good and great.

These examples should include wise fathers, heroic mothers, good sons and loving daughters, affectionate husbands, and devoted wives, generous friends and faithful lovers: worthy citizens, honourable professionals, honest tradesmen; soldiers and patriots; prophets and martyrs, worthy of their vocations. As example is better than precept, such a collection would probably prove more effective for the end in view than the course I have perforce adopted as best suited to my own methods and forms of thought and expression. Even the method of describing an ideally perfect man on the path of holiness, until he reaches the highest point attainable of a perfect union of love with God, I must reluctantly set aside as beyond my powers. Such a perfect man, in the writings of most ascetic writers

experiences such rhapsodies of mystic emotion and anagogical mystery, as are hopelessly beyond me to reproduce. Nay, to quote intelligently, in such matters, supposes, a degree however small of some similar experience. The epithalamiums celebrating the union of the soul with God, such as the Gita Govinda, or Solomon's Song of Songs are unintelligible save to those who have attained the heights of that seventh heaven, and to them any disquisition on their blessed state is as unnecessary as it must be hopelessly inadequate.

We proceed on more sober lines. what are the practical expressions of Man's relations to God? What are Man's duties to God? The fallen Wolsey said:—

“Had I but served my God with half the zeal

“I served my King, He would not in mine age

“Have left me naked to mine enemies”.

How are we to serve God?

The popular expositions of doctrine, in such diverse forms of Christianity as the Free Church of Scotland in its Shorter Catechism, and the Church of Rome in its Penny Catechism are,—*mirabile dictu*,—at one here, and as such, may be trusted to be dealing with fundamental verities. What is the end of Man? “To know God, to love Him, to serve Him faithfully in this life, and to be happy with Him for ever in the next.” How are we to know, serve, and love God? The subsequent beatification must be left to the working of Karma,—or, to the good

pleasure of God,—as we please to phrase it according to the Theistic, or Pantheistic view we follow.

But, before attacking this question, a preliminary objection demands attention. Can Man, the creature, the phenomenon, the product of Maya, essential nothingness that he is, stand in any conceivable relation to The Infinite Fullness of Essential Being called God? Of all the aberrations of human pride, surely this is the most absurd. "What is Man that Thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that Thou shouldst regard him?" The poets speak in the same strain. Says Tennyson.—

"Forgive what *seemed* my sin in me,
What *seemed* my worth since I began.

"For merit lives from man to man,

"And not from Man, O Lord, to Thee."

Similarly Wordsworth exclaims.—

"The best of what we do and are,

"Great God, forgive."

One man may deserve well or ill of another whom he benefits or harms. What need has the Infinite Fullness of us? What can it matter to Him whether we feel gratitude or resentment? Who can approach the inconceivable Majesty of His Omnipotence? But it is not as terminating in God that human relations have a value, or a reality, but as implying a reference to God's work in us,—to God in Man,—that there is any meaning in this thought of a duty to God. It were the same to God, as regards the Divine Fullness, whether Man and all his world ever had existed or not.

It is everything to Man himself whether he realize his position with reference to the source of his being, or not. It is this that makes all the difference between the religious man, and the one who has no religion; between the man of God, the saint, the regenerate, and the son of Belial, the sinner, the reprobate. And so we must understand the whole complex network of relations that bind a man to others in the God-appointed institutions of the family, the school, the state, &c., that are his environment. It is as natural, as God-willed that they bring obligations with them to restrain and direct his energies, and mould his whole being. *This realizing that it is for God's sake that all duty is done, is the first of our duties to God.* This is the practical recognition of the Omnipresence of God that the old Hebrew Scriptures phrased as "walking with God", *i.e.*, being ever conscious of a reference to Him, as our personal need, of every little daily act of life, of work or pleasure, self-regarding or altruistic. This, and not some crude imagining of an ever watchful eye, or an impalpable, all-pervading fluid Life that flows around us as the ocean surrounds and sustains the fish within its depths.

"In Him we live, and move, and have our being". In Him, and by Him and of Him in every relation of life. This is the spiritual presence of God, and not the physical immersion of our entities in Him. His Omnipresence is not a co-extension with the boundless stretches of the starry universe, no more than it is an everlasting duration co-eval with an unbeginning past

and a never-ending future. I do not deny, that, to the philosopher, the Divine Immensity and His Eternity are what finite extension and time, with their dark shadows adumbrate for man. God is an All-here, and an All-now; but the ethical aspect is what is especially of account. What is here insisted on is the necessity we are in, if we value our well-being, to "love God in all things and them all in Him, according to a well-ordered charity", as the founder of the Jesuits expresses it. The other is merely to realise, intellectually, the Omnipresence of His sustaining Energy throughout His works,—or manifestations.

The one is a spiritual, moral union with the God of all holiness; the other is a cognitive act. The former is within the reach of the most ignorant old woman who acts up to her duties, as she conceives them; the other is possible only to the philosopher, or theologian. I must make this clear. It is fundamental. It implies that all duties, as such, acquire an infinite value, first, in themselves, as has been pointed out above, and also in the infinite possibilities of progress that they throw open to the moral nature of man.

As this implies a conception of the unattainableness, in all its Divine perfection, of the highest moral worth, the natural outcome is a sense of individual inefficiency and imperfection. Even when he acts up to them, as fully as a man may, he sees that all he does is still infinitely removed from the perfection of harmony that the world of relations in which he lives is capable of attaining. This intimate sense is the virtue

of Humility. When, as almost invariably the case, a man fails in some one or more of the duties that follow from his state of life, the sense of falling away from the image of God that he is capable of becoming gives birth to the consciousness of sin. By living as God's world of nature demands that I should, I could have reproduced a copy as perfect as possible of what might be called the character of God, His Holiness. This copy I mar when I fail in my duties: when I sin.

Now, this Consciousness of Sin usually take the form of regarding Sin as an offence against God, and this arises from what has been remarked on in the opening chapters of this work, *viz.*, that Man's notions of God must be anthropomorphical. Man must conceive of God, as in some sort like himself though infinitely superior. The good or evil result of this will be taken into consideration later on. Here, it is taken into account as a fact of experience, Man regards his wrong-doings as violations of Divine command. We have seen in what sense he is justified in so thinking.

From this fact flows next a need that the sin be forgiven; Man feels it essential for his own well-being that the fierce, blood-thirsty God of his primitive imaginings be propitiated; the offended Majesty of the King of Kings be somehow placated; some reparation be made to the loving God, the Father of Mankind, for the backsliding of his sons. And this is not only a personal demand of individual nature.

It is also believed to be a condition exacted by God before things can again be well with us.

Let us consider this carefully, and with the help of an illustration. Moral worth consists in a fully developed character, so unfolded and formed by a series of virtuous acts. How is this affected by sin, by a vicious or immoral act ?

Arthur meets Bernard in a lonely place, is angered by him, and, in his anger, kills him, intending to do so. Charles hates David, and continually broods over his enmity, and would slay him, if he could do so with impunity. The fear of punishment alone restrains Charles from violence. Both Arthur and he have violated the relationship between themselves and the person of their neighbour. Both have sinned against the bond of Fraternity that, in God's world, should link man to man. Both have as a consequence, suffered a certain deterioration in their natures. How is this to be remedied, first, in its consequences, and, secondly, in itself ?

As regards the first point, those who hold the doctrine of Karma, maintain that it is irremediable and irrevocable, and the only course left is to let the dead past bury its dead. The chain of cause and effect must remain unbroken, and the inexorable result must follow. The language of the Theist Christian's Bible is wholly at one with this. "Let no man deceive himself. God is not mocked. Whatsoever a man shall sow that also surely shall he reap." The wrongdoing is the outward expression of an inner effect

in the spiritual nature of the man, and as such, has been once and forever been, and it must have its consequences. The notch cut in the sapling becomes a gnarled knot in the bark of the old tree: the healed wound leaves its scar, and, more intimately still, the sensitive structure of the brain is grooved with a set of neural processes that before the dread deed had no place. In this sense there is no wiping out the past, and no cancelling of the sin.

What then do propitiation and repentance seek to obtain? However, these too must also be kept apart if a right understanding of the truth is to be reached. "It is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God", when His Infinite designs work themselves out to the bitter end, and He visits the sins of the fathers upon the children even unto the third and fourth generation, for instance, in the hereditary taint of alcoholism that runs down from father to son. (Even here they work to final good, as when the remoter descendants of the venerealee become immune to the fell disease that made a hell of the lives of their forbears.) Propitiation to stay consequences of this kind is a crude anthropomorphism that is to be met with in ruder types of men, whose daily lives have shown them cases of chiefs and taskmasters cajoled to remit the punishments due wrong-doing. By the Theist who expects a Heaven and Hell, or purgatory to set right the inequalities of this life, a diminishing or cancelling of punishments due may be hoped for as an answer to prayer, and after repentance has brought

with it a renewal of mind and heart,—a reformed character. “Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me”. The remission of punishment is accepted as a result of this renewed nature, made possible by the Mercy of God, that has given the opportunity for the conversion. How this renewal of the character is to be obtained is, thus, *the* important question for the school of thought that accepts Karma, or its equivalent, as well as for those who deem it necessary for them to placate the judge of the living and the dead.

To make this clear let us revert to the illustration of the actual and potential murderers employed just above.

Arthur partly in consequence of the shock he has experienced at the evil that he has done, partly by the consideration that he has violated the Divine law and is guilty of having offended the great and good God of his devotions, is roused to a sense of the deplorable state of his whole moral nature. He abhors the act, and as the best means of counteracting the evil effects in himself, or out of pure love for the Divine order of the world that he has marred,—for pure love of God,—he turns his whole mind and heart to kindly deeds and to loving kindness to all men. He is, from that moment, a new man, and for him to commit another murder is a moral impossibility. Surely the state of *this* man is better after the murder than it was before his eyes were opened to the imperfections of his heart. This is the salutary repentance

that means a new life, and a better life for him. That the law of the land, by its agents discover his crime and punish him for it, or whether he escape detection, are matters that do not touch the moral condition of the man Arthur.

On the other hand we suppose Charles lives on with murderous desires festering his whole nature, all through his life, though Charles die without ever taking a human life, he is thoroughly corrupt, and the hell of a hateful character has been his lot in life, whatever happen to him after death.

The part that prayer plays in securing true repentance, as well as in perfecting the righteous man belongs to a later chapter. It may be here pointed out as the invariable concomitant and the condition *sine qua non* of all true repentance.

Remorse, or self-reproach at having been fool enough to yield to an immoral impulse is a different thing. It is part of the natural punishment of wrong-doing. It may lead no further in the direction of self-correction, or regeneration.

The paltry and despicable attitude of mind that indulges in evil doings with a procrastinating intent to repent at some future day, is a foolish misunderstanding as to what right and wrong really are. The attitude of mind is in itself an indication of an ill-formed character, of a sinful soul. It is in a way in a worse condition almost than the hardened criminal who boasts of his vice. The latter may be startled into a conception of his evil state. The other drugs him-

self with the opiate of self-deception to prolonged slumber in the poisonous atmosphere of enervating and degrading thoughts, fancies and desires "Because thou art neither hot nor cold, I will spue thee out of my mouth."

It might at first sight seem that we have gone far astray from the path marked out in the opening paragraph of this chapter. Man's duty to God was there stated to be to know Him, to serve Him, to love Him. However, as a fact, we have faithfully kept to the lines there traced out for our reflections. It is only in His manifestations in nature, and especially in the world of human nature with all the relations that it involves that we can know God; only there can we serve Him; and only in the beauties of holiness and the happiness of virtue can we find reasons for loving Him. This ineffable beauty of God,—the God who is Love,—is infinitely loveable in these relations. To dimly show this is the work of this part.

One other point, already touched on requires to be re-considered in this connection, *i.e.*, as involving a direct reference or relation to God. The majority of men rightly see their duties in their daily lives of the Home, on in public as citizens. To this the good amongst them devote all their energies, serving God as they conceive Him to desire from them in the position of life in which he has placed them. To maintain the spheres wherein the Divine charities of home, the sacred bonds of brotherly kindness and mutual help that their nation affords them, the time-honoured

institutions, manners, customs, laws, religions, &c., by which their fathers were helped to the heights of sanctity that history tells us they attained,—to maintain all these, I say, they deem to be the highest and the noblest end to which Man is capable of aspiring. To preserve the integrity of these they would lay down their lives ; and, should circumstances give them this opportunity of dying for their national institutions, they meet death with pride, and a grateful people honours them as its saviour. These are the men who are called Heroes. No honour shown to their memory is thought too great.

But, in proportion as the course of action followed by the Hero is honoured, it is apt to become less clearly a duty for God's sake. It is rather for the sake of the glory that it brings with it, for Man's sake, is it done, and to be praised of men.

However, at rare intervals, men arise, who see more clearly into the heart of things, and who realize that Man's means of self-perfecting are capable of infinite development ; that " God fulfils Himself in many ways " and that certain modifications of the present state of the world, or nation would bring with them a fuller, and an ampler life for one and all. The vision of the world that shall be, with its wider spheres of charity, its more effective curbing of ills, its greater peace and joy, are an abiding presence that impels them to ceaseless efforts to realize their dreams. And the world in the person of its recognised leaders, rises up against them and hunts them to the death. These

are the Martyrs. They serve for God's sake only and directly. He alone is their exceeding great reward. These are His chosen ones, His beloved, His prophets. They die, but they leave their thoughts as fruitful seeds destined to grow up into a harvest of an hundred fold : and so the world takes one step nearer God, to a better knowledge of Him, higher service, and a fuller love.

CHAPTER II.

GODWARDS.

In this chapter I shall once more borrow, with appologies to my Indian readers, from the language of Western theology, and methodically outline the progress of the soul of the just man along what is technically call the Purgative, Illuminative, and Unitive ways.

And here I must premise that these three ways are not necessarily always to be met with in the personal experience of each and every one in precisely this order. They are not always even mutually exclusive. In rare cases, the first, and still more rarely the first and second are dispensed with. Where this is the case, and the favoured soul enters direct into the Unitive way, it flies to the bosom of its God with the irresistible impulse of a natural, God-given affinity. But in all these ways, the ultimate motive power of all the actions of the soul is still the same, *viz.*, the love of God. It is this motive, too, that constitutes the main difference between the teachings of the Old and New

Testaments of the Christian Bible. The Mosaic dispensation summarised the natural law in the Ten Commandments of God with terrible accompaniments of thunder and lightning, and threats of punishment in cases of disobedience. On the contrary, the happiness of virtue is summarised by Christ in the Beatitudes of the New Testament. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled," Matt. v., 6. Righteousness is its own reward. This thought constitutes the entire atmosphere of the later testament, but is not altogether absent from the older writings. Especially is this so in some of the Psalm of King David. For instance in the Psalm xix., 7—12.

"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. "The statutes of the Lord are right, *rejoicing the heart*: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. "The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring for ever: the judgements of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. "More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than fine gold: sweeter than honey and the honeycomb.

"Moreover by them is Thy servant warned: and *in* keeping them there is great reward."

Not here; not 'for' keeping them, but 'in' keeping them. Similarly, to show that the proof of these statements is a fact of experience, he exclaims;—

"O taste and see that the Lord is good: blessed is the man that trusteth in Him" (Ps. xxxiv., 8).

Now, to make these considerations practical, and at the same time to bring them to a test, the best way is to persuade a good and holy man,—of any creed whatsoever,—to describe, if possible, his religious experiences. Religious emotion is present in the heart of every good man, or saint. Such persons though not so common as they might be, are still not very rare. Most men, if asked, would probably answer that they could point out more than one among their acquaintances, whom they would venture to describe as a really good man, - a saint, if one prefer that name. However, by a saint is not meant an ascetic. An ascetic may or may not deserve to be styled a holy man. The saint is rather one who fills any position of life in which he finds himself, in accordance with the relations that that position imposes upon him, and is a good husband, father, friend, citizen, professional, as the case may be. The course here recommended is to make enquiries from such a man, to persuade him to an expression of his views and feelings in conversation about the things of God. You will be astonished at the zeal and fervent love of God that some of the simplest of men will sometimes display, to your no small spiritual benefit, for such emotion is invariably contagious.

I must now point out the forms of love-inspiring beauty that reveal themselves to us in all the world of God. In the midst of this world the person of each one of us stands straitened by the bonds of countless charities in a net-work of relations, the whole of which

are gathered up into a band infinitely stronger than steel, and fastened to the footstool of the Divine Mercy and love. Until we love, we shall feel the chains about us irksome as the restraints of slavery. With love we enter into the liberty of the children of God. I would I could induce my readers to hypnotise themselves into a quasi-hysterical enthusiasm of Divine love, and then leave them to recover their normal state. In calm reason they would recognise that the Divine service does in truth bring with it a reality of ecstasy superior even to the *condition exaltée* from which they have recovered. The wonders that they might have dreamt of under the stress of artificial emotion would be surpassed by the might of the reality of Divine love.

Some such process as that which I have hinted at above was, I take it, the method employed by Ignatius of Loyola in the training of the members of his newly founded Society of Jesus, and though his followers of to-day have largely departed from his procedure in the "Spiritualia Exercitia" they have also, as largely fallen short of the great effects his methods produced in those who came under the influence of his personal direction. Be this as it may, the lines he lays down for the progress of the soul is what I shall outline in the remainder of this chapter. It is what is accepted by most ascetic writers of the West.

By the majority of men the life of the moral nature, character-building, is but little attended to through the earlier and more thoughtless years of life.

Unconscious imitation and unreasoned obedience to precept to a great extent take the place of conscious moral effort. In most cases this is the natural and normal state of the youthful mind. The facts of life are accepted without much regard to their moral bearing. Says Wordsworth of such as these in his Ode to Duty :—

“ There are who ask not if thine eye

“ Be on them ; who, in love and truth,

“ Where no misgiving is, rely

“ Upon the genial sense of youth :

“ Glad hearts : without reproach or blot,

“ Who do thy work and know it not.”

This is the passive and receptive period of life. The young will accept what is told them, for the most part, without question. This is as it should be. Without this docility, even progress in knowledge would be an impossibility. Now the gold of truth intellectual and moral, that each generation receives from its predecessor comes to it in the hard quartz of unreasonable superstition, and thick with the stiff clay of ignorance and prejudice. As time rolls on, the earthy nature of much that is placed before him as refined gold becomes apparent to the young man. After the first shock of dismay at the discovery, he turns to sift the truth for himself, and to lay bare ever so little more, it may be, of the pure vein of virgin gold, that after all really is there to repay the infinite pain and labour of his task. What he hands on should be purer than what he has received.

When this change has fully taken place they enter upon the path of the illuminative way, the path of duty.

Now this search for God in the moral order, is, very often, as said above, carried on all unconsciously. The occasion that at first opens the eyes of the young man is, usually some failure on his part to act up to the demands of his nature and God. Some violation of the moral law impresses itself upon his mind. He becomes conscious of sin. His earliest conscious effort to attain to the moral perfection of his nature, to restore to his heart and soul the lost union with God, is thus directed primarily towards getting rid of his sin. His failure to do his duty in that sphere of life in which God, or God in nature, has placed him, he ascribes to the powerful action of his bodily appetites and desires. These, therefore, he seeks to get more completely under his deliberate control. Finally he has to habituate himself to right conduct. This is the purgative way. Its end is to restore the soul to harmony with the purpose for which man conceives himself to be in this world, and of which purpose his nature is itself the revelation.

Now the means that he has to set himself right are repentance, prayer, and self-restraint. The first of these has already been described in the latter part of the last chapter. The others require a word or two of explanation.

Prayer is the expression of the emotions that the thought of God produces. In the purgative way this

emotion is one of self-abasement at one's inability to fulfil the demands of the infinitely perfect ideal of God concerning Him. Hence, in one form or another, his cry is ever, "O God, be merciful to me a sinner :"

With the perception of the strain between the moral aspirations of the soul and the reluctance of the bodily nature to the limitations that must be put upon it, the emotion results in a cry for help, albeit resigned to the Divine demand that the lower self shall be suppressed. "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me ; nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." Sometimes after the best one could do has been done, the highest type of soul perceives that a fuller life infinitely better, still remains unattained, and for the individual unattainable. Christ, upon the cross, at the end of his life, of perfect service carried out "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me !"

Divine perfection *seems* to recede to an infinite distance. And yet all that is good in the civilisation of the West to-day is due to the teachings of Christ ; all that it has of evil stands in marked and acknowledged opposition to his life and spirit.

The need for self-denial is also easily understood as necessary in the beginning of the spiritual life. The young man has found that certain of his natural tendencies, unreasonably followed, have led him to violate the demands of more blessed relations, have marred the beauty and harmony of creation for him. Of these tendencies the appetites of the body have for their end the single self only, and so oftenest bring

him into conflict, not only with his own higher and fuller nature,—the intellectual and moral,—but also tend to loosen or rupture the beatific bonds that link him to his fellow-men. As the strict limits of temperance in these matters is easily exceeded he allows himself less than what he might legitimately consider permissible. Hence, fasts and self-inflicted pain have, by many schools of ascetics in Europe and India, been resorted to as means to secure ever more and more perfect self-control.

The danger of these austerities is that by many they are mistaken for an end and a perfection in themselves, and indeed are regarded as a sort of sanctity. This is a confusion especially common among simple and untutored people. As a fact, the need for such austerities is in itself an indication of a partially undisciplined nature, of the unformed character of a tyro in the ways of God. To break in a horse, or train a wild beast for the circus, may call for very drastic measures. The broken-in horse, or the once subdued animal, is obedient to a word or a look. Indeed, they are, perhaps better taught obedience by kindness and sympathy, and are all the better for being mettlesome and spirited. The analogy holds when applied to the discipline of the body and its desires. The soul seeks bodily indulgence until it learns to love something else much more. With this higher love the body easily keeps within due bounds.

Good works are also sometimes looked upon as a means to be employed in the purgative way. They are

the natural outcome of the illuminative way. Here they are apt to be misunderstood. If good works are performed in a sort of commercial spirit, with the attempt to total up so much good as a sort of cancelling of a corresponding amount of evil, the thought is wholly unspiritual, and has but little effect in helping on the regeneration of the soul. However, when the performance of good deeds is the natural expression of sincere repentance, it takes the form of a desire to make reparation, as far as lies in our power, for the incompleteness of our past lives. For instance, an almsgiving accompanied with the wish that it were not to be done, is of little moral value. If undertaken to habituate the soul to kindly sympathy they are a natural result of a character earnest in its endeavours to attain self-realization and perfection.

In short, if these three, prayer, mortification, and good works are not the expression of the spirit itself, they are of no use whatever as means of spiritual advancement.

The second stage of the soul's progress is the illuminative way. It lies open directly to the man that has been faithful to the laws of nature, and of God. It consists practically, in the study and practice of what has been laid down in the first and second parts of this work. It includes a study of the world as it is and has been so as to learn from it the end it would appear to be following as willed by its author,—either, as the purpose of his work, or as the process of the unfolding of His nature. In either case whether as

Theists or Pantheists, we then refer as much of this process as our reason reveals to us to our position in the world. To the majority what reason tells them is very limited, but to that extent it entails obligations. Hence the illuminative way also involves a practice of those duties that reason makes known to man as a necessity of his nature.

Among Christians, motive power is given to both this study and practice, not only by the incentives of the fear of punishment, and the hope of reward. These, correctly speaking, play their part even prior to the purgative way. The chief emotional factor in their religion is their personal love for the Man-God Jesus-Christ. In Him, they believe, the best and most assuredly correct principles are to be learnt. And to Him also their faith bids them look for the most perfect example of the practice of the highest virtue. This meditation on the life and sufferings of Jesus, the study of his teachings by word and deed, and their consequent "imitation of Christ", naturally constitutes the whole method of Christian progress in perfection of character. Their ideal is to become living copies of their model,—an alter Christus.

Natural religion should look for the principle of right conduct in the teachings of all the good and great men that the world has seen, irrespective of time and place, colour, caste, or creed. In the biographies of the saints, heroes, and prophets of all ages and nations it should seek for examples for the guidance of life. It holds that God has His servants all the wide

world over, from whom lessons may be learned suited to the needs of all.

It will then be seen that the form that prayer now takes naturally should rather be called meditation. It implies thoughtful reflection, or the employment of man's reasoning in considering the facts of the world in which he lives, and their practical result, *i.e.*, the duties they imply for him who knows them. It supposes a desire for this knowledge, and for help to fulfil these obligations. Seeing God everywhere revealed in the world, there arises a desire to obey the "laws" of God, so understood. Prayer then finds its expression in some such words as those of king David, in the Psalm cxix., 33—35. "Teach me, O Lord, the way of Thy statutes; and I shall keep it unto the end. Give me understanding, and I shall keep Thy law; yea, I shall observe it with my whole heart. Make me to go in the path of Thy commandments, for therein do I delight".

Good works are now the normal daily effort of the soul, conscientiously done for the purpose of fulfilling the demands of the life of the soul; consciously directed to the building up of a perfect character.

The transition to the third stage of the soul's progress is suggested by the last words quoted above. Meditation on the world of God and His laws has revealed their eminent reasonableness, beauty, and the happiness that they bring with them. The result is a glimpse of the perfection of the source of all the good that the soul perceives. God is seen to be a

God of all goodness, loving and worthy of all love. God is our Father. God is Beauty, in the words of the Prophet Mahomed. God is Love. With this perception, as an intimate personal experience the perfection of the soul is assured, although no longer thought of. Good works are performed without regard to their results, as says the Bhagwat Git, and from sheer love for them.

"Love took up the harp of life, and smote on all the chords with might.

"Smote the chord of self that, trembling, passed in music out of sight."

Man's study is now how to love God daily more and more. Anything done for love is a joy forever. The soul now follows the path before it with ease. Its development is a rapid joyous growth. Having attained to this the highest stage in its normal advance towards union with God, Man finds himself in a state of unassailable bliss.

"Serene will be our days and bright,

"And happy will our nature be,

"When love is an unerring light,

"And joy its own security."

The ecstasy of mutual delight that lovers,—bride and bridegroom, know, has, by writers on these matters both east and west, been considered as alone capable of faintly shadowing forth the raptures of this Divine union. Prayer is now a cry of longing and of love. In a Spanish Love-Sonnet, the great Francis Xavier voiced the emotions of his love-laden soul. "O God, I

love Thee : and I do not love Thee that Thou shouldest save me, or because Thou dost punish those not loving Thee with eternal fire,...but solely because Thou art my King, and only because Thou art my God."—" My beloved to me and I to Him," cries Solomon.

Such is the glorious destiny of the heart of man here on earth. Of the future he has no care. It is in the hands of a loving God.

The sign, the means, and also, the expression of all the steps of this onward march towards God is always Prayer. It begins as a cry for God's help and mercy ; is an entreaty for light and strength later on ; and, culminates in sighs of longing love. " Pray always " is thus seen to be a natural law. It is itself a guarantee of ultimate attainment. " Ask, and it shall be given you ; seek, and ye shall find ; knock, and it shall be opened unto you : For every one that asketh, receiveth ; and he that seeketh, findeth ; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened. " So be it.

CHAPTER III.

THE BEAUTY OF GOD.

We have seen among the love-inspiring names of God that He was Beauty, that God was Love, but here the question arises, which God ? The notion of God in its primitive forms is inchoate, crude and savage. On the other hand, in its highest and most subtle forms, it is not only admittedly inadequate, but also far beyond the understandings of the great majority of men. What is conveyed to the man in the street by telling him

that God is Essential Being, the infinite I AM? How can this ineffable name serve to stir the emotions? In its highest as in its lowest forms there does not seem to be much beauty, love, and joy connected with the notion of God.

This statement as it stands is true, but here two or three considerations are of value to meet the objection.

First, it must not be forgotten that the notion of God is always an expression of the highest ideal that the mind of any man is capable of forming,—it is a notion of something infinitely superior to himself, whom he is called upon to imitate. "Be ye therefore perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect" Anthropomorphic in its highest as in its lowest forms, it is the notion of Man idealised. This is natural, and this also is well. According to the measure of the loftiness of his ideal is the measure of his development. His ideals are the source of all man's progress. It is precisely because the notion is anthropomorphic,—man-like—that it becomes a notion of something knowable, loveable, imitable. To the simple-minded, the more human, the more powerful in arousing their emotions. This is why avatars and incarnations are so effective in moulding the lives and customs of a people.

But again here a word of warning is needed. If the notion degenerate so as to become merely man, and is no longer manlike while remaining more than man, it ceases to be an ideal. ceases to possess any elevating power, moral or spiritual. This is also a

danger of religions that reject incarnations, such as Judaism and Islam, though in another way. By the very nature of human thought, man must think of God as manlike, each one according to the measure of his mind and heart. The savage imagines a cruel God, and so on. The belief in an incarnation emphasises that the human aspect of God in this or that avatar cannot but be inferior to the infinite in this or that manifestation, which are admittedly finite and limited. These religions have to take care not to believe that a finite representation can exhaust the God head as it is *seen* in the incarnation. However individual Moslems and Jews have to guard against mistaking their imaginations and mind-made pictures of God to be true copies of the unimaginable, in conceivable and Infinite Reality. This supplies a strong reason for the strictness with which such religions wisely forbid the making of any pictorial or graven image of God. These would but serve to perpetuate a necessarily false and wholly inadequate conception of God. But more than this is needed. All men should carefully, consciously, and continually correct their highest imaginations by ever adding to its beauty, loveableness and perfection; and by ever acknowledging that with every new addition the Infinitely perfect Reality remains unknown and unknowable. Where this is not done, the ideal deteriorates, becomes stereotyped, and cramps the mental, moral, and spiritual development of the man.

The second consideration of value here to meet the objection stated above, consists in reflecting that the

intellect is not the only, nor even the chief means of approach to God. The most trustworthy help to Godwards for the soul is found in right conduct, to which, of course the conviction that there is a God is a necessary preliminary. But this must be more than a mere intellectual conviction. It must be a practical faith. I may know that the two sides of a triangle are greater than the third, and employ this knowledge in processes of reasoning, but it becomes a faith when it regulates my life, when it becomes something that I so accept as to act upon it; when I use it, as it were, instinctively, for instance, in going across the diagonal of a square field instead of going around by the two sides. Similarly, the notion of a good God, and the conviction that such a God exists, is of no religious or spiritual value until it influences conduct and moral endeavour. This is the thought underlying the whole second part of this book. With such a faith as a living motive principle in the soul, Man approaches nearer God to a most wonderful degree, and experiences the joy that comes from Divine service faithfully and loyally fulfilled. The proof of this statement is the personal experience of all good men that the world has known, some of whom found in the joy and peace of their minds ample compensation for the most awful sufferings inflicted on them by the mistaken zeal or vicious fury of those who opposed their ideals. This is the path that is open to the primitive mind, the simplest child, the most unlettered and untutored of the sons of men. God by this path of conduct is as accessible to all

as the rays of the sun that He maketh to shine upon the just and unjust alike.

Finally, it is needful to remark here that a more direct and easy way, and one more satisfying is that supplied by the emotions, and to show how this is to be followed is what is attempted in these last chapters, by the thought of God's Omnipresence and Immanence.

We cannot love and possess the far-off and the unattainable. Love is joy in present possession, or at worst, in the hope of it. We can admire only the beauty that we see; love the goodness that benefits us; rejoice in the happiness of pouring forth our affections on a present lover. Now, reason tells us that God is everywhere: Right conduct enables us to experience His benefits, and contemplation allows us to breathe forth our love in ecstasies of joy. To see God everywhere, to see His Goodness everywhere is to love Him, and to be happy with Him. This faith,—as explained above,—in God's presence is Man's happiness on earth. It transforms a dry, intellectual conception into a living fount of love and joy.

The first of the ways in which we may make the presence of God an abiding reality to our minds is by the contemplation of the material world around us. We have seen that this world material, intellectual, and moral, in which we live, is from God, either produced as an outbreathing and emanation of his nature, or, as the result of his action causing it to be, and to continue in existence. Either way it tells of him. When we see a

beautiful building, or a picture by some great master-artist, the mind has not only the pleasure of the beauty so produced, but it is further able to judge of the nature of the artist's imaginations, and to say, "What delightful visions of loveliness must his mind have revelled in, so that he could have been capable of such a work as this." So is it with the natural beauties that proceed from the Divine author of all existence. Poets have raved in ecstasies of delight over the beauties of the world from the dew-drop that impearls the soft green carpet of the grass, the sweet melody of little birds, the exquisite colours, shapes and scents of flowers, the perfections of the human body, its graceful elegance and shapeliness, and its play of features, eyes, lips and cheeks, to the magnificence of natural scenery, lake and forest, mountain and sea, cloud and sky, in the morning, at noon or at eve, or when night reveals yet other phases of splendour in moon and stars. Truly the most beautiful things are the most common. It is a pleasure not soon forgotten to have known a poet intimately so that he spoke unreservedly of the beauty and splendour of his thoughts, of the visions of loveliness that were ever present to his imagination, and what are all the glories of Nature but the thoughts of God as made known to us. The Divine mind is an ocean of Beauty, and that Beauty speaks to us day and night if we but open our minds and hearts to hear and understand. Man alone knows the language of beauty. No horse ever stopped to admire a sunset in scarlet and gold, or a bird to rejoice in the grandeur of a

lion's display of power and muscular energy. Man naturally possesses the alphabet of beauty, but unless he accustom himself to read in the book of Nature, he can know little of the joy that lies around him in the peeps that these afford into the Infinite Beauty of God's own Thoughts. It is so easy, so pleasant to learn to look with admiration and love on all this beauty that it is a wonder that the majority of men are still scarce able to spell the simplest of the secrets of God that He so freely, bountifully, wastefully, would reveal to us. Coolness and warmth, scent and sound, shape and colour, are the elements of an exquisite world that the senses can expound to us if we but stop to mark. This is for every man. "The joy of life in widest commonalty spread."

To the scientific student of nature, the wonder and delight become a million fold increased if he do not lose himself in the mere details of his study. The mysteries of life that Biology peers into with scalpel and microscope, the wonderful action of Nature's forces as studied by the Chemist, and Physicist, and the stupendous vastnesses that the Astronomer gazes upon and makes known to us with spectroscope and telescope, are these not an ever present delight and joy to the really scientific mind? All that reveals God gives joy. It is a sharing in our finite human way in the Divine knowledge, and God's knowledge and Love of His Infinite Beauty is the source of the Divine Life of joy, and the source of all finite joy.

But it is specially the beauty in common things

that speaks to the mind that is willing to read. Says Tennyson:—

“Flower in the crannied wall,

“I pluck you out of the crannies.

“I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,

“Little Flower,—but if I could understand

„What you are, root and all, and all in all

“I should know what God and man is.”

These considerations have, perhaps even a yet more powerful influence, if the mind has been trained to see in Nature the outer aspect of God Himself, the body of the great Over-soul, or paramatma, the vesture of appearances merely that veils the inner and Infinite Reality. However, in this work more space has been given to the conception of God as a person, because that notion,—though admittedly an inadequate idea, is yet for all that, more powerful in stirring the emotions of the human heart. Indeed, except for the philosopher, the subtler concept is beyond the reach of most men. A philosopher is after all not oftener to be met with than in the proportion of one in a million. Besides, the notion ‘God’ includes all the perfections implied in the word ‘person,’ and infinitely more, or in an infinite degree. The notion is not false but incomplete as every human notion of God must necessarily be.

Finally, before closing this chapter, it might be as well to put our ideas of physical evil,—loss and death,

into their proper places, and if possible, view them in right perspective. We must insist and try to realize that these evils are in the very nature of finiteness. However perfect a creature may be there must be an end to its perfections, a limit to the range of its powers. This does not touch the bounty of the infinite Giver of all good, the source of all that is. Whatever perfection, or good, or being, anything possesses, the thanks and praise for all of it is due to its Author. It is not boundless or endless in good because the thing is in itself finite, and could not but be so without ceasing to be itself, and becoming infinite and divine. Its defects are its own, its good all from God.

The preceding remarks do not apply to moral evil which calls for separate consideration later on.

This being so is it any wonder that poets and holy men break out into rhapsodies of gratitude and love for the great and good God, the source of all life and light and joy ; that they should call upon the heavens and the earth, the sun, moon and stars, the mountains and hills, the winds and the waves, the forests and fields, the birds and flowers, and even on " Sister Sleep " and " Brother Death " to unite in praising God. Some of the Psalms of David are striking examples. Another beautiful instance is the grand poem by Coleridge entitled, " Hymn before Sunrise, in the Valley of Chamouni. "

CHAPTER IV.

The Love of God.

In this chapter are brought forward certain reflections on what might be called the Real Presence of God in the world. These reflections are based on what are called the Immanence of God, the Divine Concurrence, and Divine Providence. Each of these calls for a word or two emphasising the effect that these great truths should naturally have on our emotions of love and reverence for God.

The opening words of the Christian's Universal Prayer, taught by Jesus to his disciples, are to a certain extent capable of being misunderstood. "Our Father, who art in Heaven," for all Christians, save, perhaps, one in ten thousand, gives rise to the conception of a remote heavenly court of the Divine Majesty, where the Godhead rules with fatherly love, and in endless happiness and glory the countless host of angels and men that surround the throne of His Justice and Mercy. How crudely human such a conception is must be patent to the thinking mind. God is everywhere, then, why, in heaven? This objection to the phrase is nothing new, as I hope I can proudly say of all I have here written. The objection is old, and the old answer given was that though God was everywhere. His fullest manifestation was in Heaven, wherever that might be. There is now-a-days no need to imagine a Dantesque Heaven distributed throughout the planetary circles, or a Miltonic Heavenly court beyond the primum mobile and the crystalline sphere

of the fixed stars. Heaven is where God is known and loved to the full capacity of the human soul. Here in my study, as I write, I can well conceive the Glory of God revealed to and rejoicing with its Beatific vision the souls, perhaps, of my father and mother,—Why not? I know that this is but a sweet dream of my human heart, not intrinsically impossible, yet without a shred of evidence to support it. It is here mentioned to counteract the equally unfounded notion of a Heaven remote and far away. Besides, as M. Camille Flammarion, the poet-astronomer of France, expresses it, the Earth, as it sweeps through space with its centre the sun, is as much in the Heavens as the Milky way, amongst whose myriad stars we must account great Phoebus but as one of the lesser glories.

If then, there be no need to look for a definite area to assign to Heaven, can we see God manifest here on earth, at least to the eye of reason now, and, perhaps, with a fuller vision after death,—or, after many lives and deaths—as the various creeds of the world have promised to faith?

To the question, "Where is God", reason answers, with clear and unhesitating voice, "Here, and everywhere,—All here. All everywhere"—This is worth attention. The Real Presence of God exists in and permeates, and dwells in all, within and without. "In him we live and move and have our being." Without him all would cease to be. And as all remains in being because of him, so also is it with all action. All

action exists, because God exists in it; acts in the action. "Let not the red slayer think he slays" It is Power, Divine, and Infinite that underlies the slayer's finite blows. This is what is called the Concurrence of God in all actions. Each action is ascribeable to two: to God, for being; so that it may be; so as to be able to be: and to man, for willing it to be. And that willing of man's also exists, because of God; because God gives man's will the power to will and to desire this or that. Mark here the greatness of the gift that the Omnipresent God bestows on man. "Will to act as you may, I shall give your actions being", He seems to say. We are free to act because he wills us free.

Here we are face to face with the old difficulty, yet more strongly put. How can the perfect God, the God of all holiness, who knows that all should be directed to Him alone, allow finite wills, as far as in them lies, to direct the world to their own petty ends instead of to Him. This is the crux of what is called the problem of evil. How can a Holy God tolerate sin; nay, help man in the very execution of sin, even though it be but physically?

The only answer is, that He has given man thus much of the Divine Nature, that he shall know and will. Man is a person. This personality could not be without involving the possibility of the will seeking itself and not God. Were men like inanimate nature, subtle machines, all things would proceed without sin, or even error,—but also, without love for God. Man

is free, and now his service is worthy of acceptance. It may be, and can be, the service of a son. On the other hand, even though free, man does not, as a fact, even when erring, hinder the Divine purpose, be that what it may. We are persons, with a spark of God's own personality. At the least, we are images of His personality. We direct the actions of God Himself, for so He lets it be, and yet all works to the end that God knows and God alone.

Thus is God with us always. Whether we eat, or drink, or sleep, sin or serve God, all is with God's help, because he sustains, tolerates and just lets the action be. It is not a far-off God to whom we have to cry aloud that He might hear. "He is nearer to us than breathing, closer than hands and feet." Learn to know and love the prefections of this Infinite God once for all, and heaven lies about us from our infancy. Shun the laws His will has appointed for us, and revealed in nature, and hell is as near.

The key-note to the harmony of the divine laws, for man, is given by one word, "unselfishness." This is clearly God's will, for thus alone is man happy. It is not a matter of argumentation, but a fact of experience, yours and mine and everyone's. There is only one sin, selfishness. And this sin is easy to avoid: love God, and man, for God's sake. And to love God is easy: we have only to know Him. And to know Him is easy, for He is everywhere making Himself known, to the mind of man through his reason, to the heart of man through his conduct. And the path of

right reason is easy : it is what all the world admits. And the path of right conduct is easy to know : it is what all the world approves ; and easy to follow ; its reward is pleasure, and joy, and its punishment is pain. And all this process is called the working of Divine Providence. By this means are things, all actions, all men, all events, working "to that far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves."

Finally, we have a right of audience with God when and where and as often as we please, by means of prayer. A last few words on these connected thoughts of Divine Providence and prayer are here necessary to bring out more clearly the goodness and loveableness of our present God.

There is a modern tendency to decry the efficacy of prayer in the name of Science, and, even in the name of God. It is a petty and a foolish notion of men that God should be prayed to alter the whole course of the laws of nature, and of the universe to gratify a single human being in some fond childish craving. My friend is sick, and I pray God to cure him. Shall the laws that govern the world be set aside, and a miracle performed, because, forsooth, my heart is sick with foreboding that a man shall die ? Surely this is the madness of human pride ? Ay, so it would be were God to possess the power and knowledge of a million Akbars, Elizabeths, and Napoleons only. The objectors fail to see how God can answer prayer, without upsetting His whole scheme to gratify His petitioner. And against this stands the

united conviction of the whole human race, that in every land and age cries out, "Justice, O God, against mine enemy," "Mercy, O God, for my friend," "Help, O God for my necessity." Has reason nothing to say in support of this blind, instinctive cry for divine aid?

Now, in the first place, it is instinctive, *i. e.*, natural, and so, right: but if right, then, surely, not in vain. But yet again, how can it be? It would appear that it matters not if one can not say how,—Who is man that he shall set limits to the means at the disposal of the divine will? And yet again, it seems that the whole difficulty arises from the fact that not the one who prays, but the one who deems prayer useless, is misled by an anthropomorphic conception of God. Of course the impulse to pray may often, indeed almost invariably, does spring from a human idea of God, but that does not hinder the objective Infinite Reality, God, providing for the answer to anthropomorphically inspired prayer. If God himself were after all no more than a magnified man he could not answer prayer without changing his whole scheme of management of the universe. It need not be so if we conceive that the Infinite Eternity of God in its boundless, full, and ever present Now sees, and foresees, all the prayers that have been, are, and shall be directed to him by the race of man. His whole plan has, humanly speaking, already taken into account all prayers, and the result is a Divine Providence that can hear prayers, by natural means. Whe-

ther the result be attained by natural processes or not does not touch the efficacy of prayer. De facto prayers are answered.

Of course this does not mean that every foolish prayer shall be granted. The father snatches away the knife from the child that cries for it, and lifts it away from near the fire in spite of its struggles. Another toy can easily be found to quiet it. And if our friend die, because it is best for him and best for us, then we, if we believe in a loving and Divine Providence, can, though with streaming eyes, repeat, "Even so, father, for so it hath seemed pleasing in thy sight."

God is beauty, God is goodness, God is a loving Providence, God is an ever present God, and from those thoughts we may learn to love him for ourselves. In all these there is joy in beauty as seen and admired, *i. e.*, finitely: There is gratitude for benefits received, and hope of favours yet to come from the God we see and know all around. He is loved for our own sakes.

There is a higher love, a holier and a truer love, and also therefore a happier love. It is the self forgetting love. It gives all and asks nothing. Such was the love of Galahad. "If I lose myself, I find myself." This is the sweet paradox of love that every true lover knows. Oh, to do something for the one we love, to be spent in his service: At this stage, the mind in contemplation takes up one by one all the beauties that it has pieced together, and tells them over and over again, but now with a selfless rejoicing that the list is and must be infinitely

less than the reality of the Infinite Beauty, Love and Joy. The quiet mind that wakes to ecstasy in the arms of the Divine Lover, rejoices only in this that his Beloved is all worthy of love and joy. Death and pain and loss are not worth a thought. "Is not God forever blest?" Romances of human love tell how exquisite and sweet it is to die for the beloved. The saints and holy men of all ages and lands repeat the story of bliss a million-fold more intense, as they spend themselves and die for God. Read the stories of their lives. It is not a weak and faltering moralist such as I, who may venture to describe what he does not know, but of which he only dreams.

God is Beauty. God is Love. God is Joy. I love and my love is my joy, and life to me is death, for perhaps it holds me back from a yet fuller, truer knowledge and closeness of union with my Love. "O who will deliver me from the body of this death?" It is related of a holy man that he said he should surely die of grief were he certain that he was not to die soon and be with God, His Love. So in a way Buddha's dream comes true. All earthly desires fade and pass. "I live, no, not I, but my *Beloved* liveth in me."

To strengthen this thought it may be as well to point out that, in a sense, God, similarly, loves creation, loves you and me. We are useless to Him, needless to His happiness and Infinite perfection and Fulness. Yet He can be rightly thought of as having a special love for each individual existing thing—a love of preference. This follows from the reflection that in place

